arXiv:1510.03795v2 [math.KT] 15 Oct 2015

Formulae in noncommutative Hodge theory

NICK SHERIDAN[1]

ABSTRACT: This paper is about noncommutative Hodge theory, in the sense of Kontsevich. We use Barannikov's language of 'variations of semi-infinite Hodge structures', abbreviated VSHS [Bar01]. We introduce various degenerate notions of VSHS. Using that language, our main theorem says that: to any A_∞ category $\mathcal{C}$, one can associate its negative cyclic homology $\mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C})$; Getzler's Gauss-Manin connection [Get93] endows $\mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C})$ with the structure of an *unpolarized pre*-VSHS; if $\mathcal{C}$ is furthermore *proper*, then Shklyarov's higher residue pairing [Shk13] defines a *polarization*; and these structures are Morita invariant. If the category is smooth and the noncommutative Hodge-to-de Rham spectral sequence degenerates, then this polarized pre-VSHS is in fact a polarized VSHS. Much of this is well-known: the main point of the paper is to present complete proofs, and also formulae for all of the relevant structures in the A_∞ setting, with unified conventions. Explicit formulae are necessary as part of a project of Ganatra, Perutz and the author, to realize Barannikov's and Kontsevich's ideas and extract information about Gromov-Witten invariants from the Fukaya category [GPS15].

Contents

1 Introduction **2**
1.1 Variations of semi-infinite Hodge structures (VSHS) . . . 3
1.2 Hochschild invariants of A_∞ categories . . . 3
1.3 Mirror symmetry motivation . . . 5

2 Variations of semi-infinite Hodge structures: definitions **6**
2.1 Pre-VSHS . . . 6
2.2 VSHS . . . 7
2.3 Euler gradings . . . 7

3 Hochschild invariants of A_∞ categories **8**
3.1 dg categories . . . 8
3.2 A_∞ categories . . . 9
3.3 Hochschild cohomology . . . 11
3.4 Hochschild homology . . . 11
3.5 Kodaira-Spencer maps . . . 14
3.6 Cyclic homology . . . 15
3.7 The Getzler-Gauss-Manin connection . . . 17

[1]The author was partially supported by the National Science Foundation through Grant number DMS-1310604, and under agreement number DMS-1128155. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

4 Bimodules **19**
4.1 Morita equivalence . . . 19
4.2 Hochschild cohomology . . . 19
4.3 Hochschild homology . . . 21
4.4 Kodaira-Spencer maps . . . 24

5 Pairings on Hochschild and cyclic homology **25**
5.1 The Mukai pairing for dg categories . . . 25
5.2 A_∞ multifunctors . . . 27
5.3 The Mukai pairing for A_∞ bimodules . . . 30
5.4 Higher residue pairing on dg categories . . . 33
5.5 Higher residue pairing for A_∞ bimodules . . . 34
5.6 The higher residue pairing is covariantly constant . . . 36
5.7 Symmetry . . . 38
5.8 Hodge to de Rham degeneration . . . 39

A Morita equivalence **40**

B Functoriality of the Getzler-Gauss-Manin connection **43**

C Graphical sign convention **47**
C.1 The idea . . . 47
C.2 Sign diagrams for operations in this paper . . . 47

Bibliography **53**

1 Introduction

Standing notation. Let $\Bbbk \subset \mathbb{K}$ be fields. We will write $\mathcal{M} := \operatorname{Spec} \mathbb{K}$, and $T\mathcal{M} := \operatorname{Der}_\Bbbk \mathbb{K}$. We fix a grading group throughout: more precisely, we fix a 'grading datum' in the sense of [She15], which is an abelian group Y together with morphisms $\mathbb{Z} \to Y \to \mathbb{Z}/2$ whose composition is non-zero. All of our structures are Y-graded; when we talk about an element of degree $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we really mean its degree is the image of k under the map $\mathbb{Z} \to Y$; and when we write a Koszul-type sign $(-1)^{|a|}$, it means that the image of the Y-degree of a, under the map $Y \to \mathbb{Z}/2$, is $|a| \in \mathbb{Z}/2$.

We denote by $\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$ the graded ring of formal power series in a formal variable u of degree 2 (i.e., the graded completion of $\mathbb{K}[u]$ – e.g., if the morphism $\mathbb{Z} \to Y$ is injective, the completion has no effect). Similarly, we denote by $\mathbb{K}(\!(u)\!)$ the graded ring of formal Laurent series. For any $f \in \mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$ or $\mathbb{K}(\!(u)\!)$, we denote

$$f^\star(u) := f(-u).$$

If $\sigma \in \mathbb{Z}/2$ is some sign, we denote by $\sigma' := \sigma - 1$ the opposite (or 'reduced') sign.

1.1 Variations of semi-infinite Hodge structures (VSHS)

The notion of a *variation of semi-infinite Hodge structures*, or VSHS for short, was introduced in [Bar01] (see also [CIT09, Section 2.2] and [Gro11, Chapter 2]). We introduce various degenerate versions of a VSHS: let us give a rough guide to how to think about them (the precise definitions are given in Section 2.1).

The notion of VSHS is inspired by the usual notion of a variation of Hodge structures, but is somewhat different: under certain conditions, an *unpolarized* VSHS over a complex manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is equivalent to a finite-rank complex vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$ equipped with a decreasing filtration (called the Hodge filtration), as well as a flat connection ∇ satisfying Griffiths transversality; a *polarization* for $\mathcal{E}$ is a covariantly constant, non-degenerate pairing $(\cdot,\cdot)$ that respects the Hodge filtration in a certain way.

The prototypical example arises when $\mathcal{X} \to B$ is a smooth family of compact complex manifolds over the base B: then the vector bundle arises as the Gauss-Manin local system $H^\bullet(\mathcal{X}_b)$ of cohomologies of the fibres, the filtration is the usual Hodge filtration, the flat connection is the Gauss-Manin connection, and the pairing is the intersection pairing.

We will review some basic definitions and facts about VSHS in Section 2, and also introduce weaker notions: that of an unpolarized pre-VSHS, in which the finite-rank complex vector bundle is replaced by an arbitrary $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{M}$-module, and that of a polarized pre-VSHS, which is an unpolarized pre-VSHS equipped with a polarization, which may however be degenerate. A (polarized or unpolarized) VSHS is the same thing as a (polarized or unpolarized) pre-VSHS with certain additional properties: finite-dimensionality, freeness, and (if polarized) non-degeneracy. In particular, whether we have a pre-VSHS or a VSHS is a question of properties of the data, rather than additional data.

1.2 Hochschild invariants of A_∞ categories

Our main result is about the Hochschild invariants of A_∞ categories:

Theorem A *To any $\mathbb{K}$-linear graded A_∞ category $\mathcal{C}$ we can associate:*

(1) *Hochschild cohomology, $\mathsf{HH}^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$, which is a unital graded $\mathbb{K}$-algebra.*

(2) *A Kodaira-Spencer map, $\mathsf{KS} : \mathsf{Der}_\mathbb{k}\,\mathbb{K} \to \mathsf{HH}^2(\mathcal{C})$.*

(3) *Hochschild homology, $\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$, which is a graded $\mathsf{HH}^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$-module.*

(4) *Negative cyclic homology, $\mathsf{HC}^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$, which is an unpolarized pre-VSHS over $\mathsf{Spec}\,\mathbb{K}$: the connection ∇^{GGM} is Getzler's Gauss-Manin connection [Get93]. The associated graded of the connection is given by cupping with the Kodaira-Spencer map.*

(5) *If $\mathcal{C}$ is proper and admits an n-dimensional weak proper Calabi-Yau structure, then $(\mathsf{HC}^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C}), \nabla^{GGM})$ admits a natural polarization $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{res}$ of dimension n, given by Shklyarov's higher residue pairing [Shk13].*

All of these structures are Morita invariant. If $\mathcal{C}$ is proper, smooth and the noncommutative Hodge-to-de Rham spectral sequence degenerates, then the polarized pre-VSHS $(\mathsf{HC}^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C}), \nabla, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{res})$ is in fact a polarized VSHS.

Remark 1.1 We recall that a conjecture of Kontsevich and Soibelmann [KS08, Conjecture 9.1.2] says that the noncommutative Hodge-to-de Rham spectral sequence degenerates for any proper, smooth $\mathcal{C}$.

Remark 1.2 Let us comment on the originality of Theorem A. We believe our contribution ranges from 'writing down explicit formulae for known structures with uniform sign conventions, as a handy reference' at the low end, to 'checking that these structures have certain natural (but slightly tricky-to-prove) compatibilities' at the high end. To be precise:

- The algebra and module structures on Hochschild homology and cohomology of an A_∞ category, and their Morita invariance, are completely standard. Our only contribution is to write down the explicit formulae (some of which have also appeared elsewhere, e.g. [Gan13]), and a proof of Morita invariance adapted to the A_∞ setting.
- The Kodaira-Spencer map is closely related to the Kaledin class, see [Kal07, Lun10]: we are not aware that its Morita invariance has previously been written down.
- We believe that our proof of the Morita invariance of the Getzler-Gauss-Manin connection is new.
- Shklyarov's construction of the higher residue pairing for dg categories [Shk13] immediately gives the construction for A_∞ categories, because any A_∞ category is quasi-equivalent to a dg category via the Yoneda embedding. Our main contribution is to establish a compact, chain-level formula for the higher residue pairing in the case of A_∞ categories whose morphism spaces are finite-dimensional on the chain level (Proposition 5.37), generalizing Shklyarov's formula [Shk13, Proposition 2.6]. This formula turns out to be convenient for the intended application to Fukaya categories [GPS15].
- Using our explicit formula for the higher residue pairing, we establish that it is covariantly constant with respect to the Getzler-Gauss-Manin connection: we believe that this result is also new (a related result was proven by Shklyarov in [Shk13], but that was for a different version of Getzler's connection, namely the one in the u-direction rather than in the direction of the base).

Let us give a guide, to help the reader find the proofs of the different parts of Theorem A. Morita invariance of Hochschild cohomology is proved in Corollary 4.10. Morita invariance of the Kodaira-Spencer map is proved in Proposition 4.16. Morita invariance of Hochschild homology is proved in Lemma 4.12. Morita invariance of negative cyclic homology and the Getzler-Gauss-Manin connection is proved in Corollary 4.15. Morita invariance of the higher residue pairing is proved in Proposition 5.35. Covariant constancy of the higher residue pairing, with respect to the Getzler-Gauss-Manin connection, is proved in Corollary 5.40. Symmetry of the higher residue pairing (which is the only part that requires the weak proper Calabi-Yau structure) is proved in Lemma 5.43. The fact that the pre-VSHS is in fact a VSHS, when $\mathcal{C}$ is proper, smooth and satisfies the degeneration hypothesis, is proved in Theorem 5.46.

Remark 1.3 The paper involves a lot of long formulae composing multilinear operations in complicated ways, with non-trivial sign factors. We explain a graphical notation for these composition rules in Appendix C, that allows one to check various identities, with signs, in an efficient way; and we draw the graphical notation for the trickiest signs that appear in the paper. We omit the proofs of some identities that become trivial using the graphical notation; however, we have tried very hard to write down explicitly the correct signs for every operation we define.

1.3 Mirror symmetry motivation

This paper is part of a joint project of the author with Ganatra and Perutz, relating to mirror symmetry [GPS15]: let us explain where it fits in.

Mirror symmetry originally arose in the string theory literature. It predicts the existence of certain 'mirror' pairs of Calabi-Yau Kähler manifolds, X and Y, so that the Gromov-Witten invariants of X can be extracted from periods of Y, and vice-versa. The first thrilling application of mirror symmetry was the prediction of the number of rational curves, in all degrees, on the quintic threefold X [CdlOGP91], by evaluating periods of the mirror manifold Y. This prediction, together with many more examples of mirror symmetry, were later mathematically verified [Giv96, LLY97].

The genus-zero Gromov-Witten invariants can be packaged into the *A-model* VSHS, and the variation of Hodge structures on a family of complex manifolds can be packaged into the *B-model* VSHS. Then, if X and Y are mirror manifolds, mirror symmetry predicts that the A-model VSHS on X ought to be isomorphic to the B-model VSHS on Y, and vice-versa: this implies explicit predictions for the Gromov-Witten invariants of X in terms of periods of Y, and vice-versa. Call this *Hodge-theoretic mirror symmetry*.

Kontsevich proposed a generalization of the mirror symmetry conjecture, called *homological mirror symmetry* [Kon95]. It predicts that, if X and Y are mirror, then there ought to be a quasi-equivalence of A_∞ categories between $\mathrm{tw}^\pi \mathcal{F}uk(X)$ (the split-closed derived Fukaya category of X) and $D^bCoh(Y)$ (a dg enhancement of the bounded derived category of coherent sheaves on Y – it is automatically split-closed if Y is projective), and vice-versa.

Kontsevich also predicted that homological mirror symmetry ought to imply Hodge-theoretic mirror symmetry. This was subsequently made more precise [Bar02, KKP08]: the expectation is that the cyclic homology of a proper, smooth A_∞ category (for which the Hodge-to-de Rham degeneration conjecture holds) ought to carry a VSHS (among other structures), and that the VSHS on the cyclic homology of the Fukaya category is isomorphic to the A-model VSHS, while that on the bounded derived category of coherent sheaves is isomorphic to the B-model VSHS. Therefore, the equivalence of categories implies an isomorphism of VSHS, as predicted by Hodge-theoretic mirror symmetry.

Our Theorem A shows that, indeed, one can associate a VSHS to any proper, smooth A_∞ category for which the Hodge-to-de Rham conjecture holds, and that this association is functorial. In [GPS15], we give a criterion under which the VSHS on the negative cyclic homology of the Fukaya category is isomorphic to the A-model VSHS, making use of some of the explicit formulae derived in this paper. Assuming the corresponding statement for the B-model (large parts of which are known), it follows that homological mirror symmetry for the quintic three-fold [She15] implies Hodge-theoretic mirror symmetry, and hence gives an alternative proof of the mirror symmetry predictions for curve counts on the quintic.

Acknowledgments. I would like to thank Sheel Ganatra and Tim Perutz, my collaborators on the larger project of which this paper is a part (see [GPS15, PS15, PS, GPS]). The material in this paper was originally intended to form a background section to one of the papers in that series, but it turned out to be so long, and in such a different direction, that it made sense to split it off. Conversations with Ganatra and Perutz, and their suggestions, were extremely helpful in completing the paper. I am also very grateful to Paul Seidel for helpful conversations about the Mukai pairing. I am also grateful to the IAS and the Instituto Superior Técnico for hospitality while working on this project.

2 Variations of semi-infinite Hodge structures: definitions

Variations of semi-infinite Hodge structures (which we abbreviate 'VSHS') were introduced in [Bar01]. Here we recall the basic facts about them. We follow [CIT09, Section 2.2] and [Gro11, Chapter 2], with some modifications. We break with certain conventions in the literature, for which we apologize. We point out the places where our conventions differ as we go along.

2.1 Pre-VSHS

Definition 2.1 An *unpolarized pre*-VSHS over $\mathcal{M}$ consists of:

- A graded $\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$-module $\mathcal{E}$.
- A flat connection[2] ∇ of degree 0,
$$\nabla : T\mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathcal{E} \to u^{-1}\mathcal{E}.$$

Definition 2.2 A *polarization* for a pre-VSHS is a pairing
$$(\cdot,\cdot) : \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E} \to \mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$$
of degree 0, which satisfies the following conditions:

- The pairing is *sesquilinear*, i.e., it is additive in both inputs and
$$(f \cdot s_1, g \cdot s_2) = f \cdot g^\star \cdot (s_1, s_2)$$
for $f \in \mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$.
- The pairing is *covariantly constant* with respect to ∇, i.e.,
$$uX(s_1,s_2) = (u\nabla_X s_1, s_2) + (s_1, u\nabla_X s_2).$$
- The pairing is *anti-symmetric*, i.e.,
$$(s_1,s_2) = (-1)^{n+|s_1|\cdot|s_2|}(s_2,s_1)^\star$$
for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}/2$ which we call the *dimension*.

Remark 2.3 It is not usually assumed that a polarization must have degree 0: we prefer to shift whatever pre-VSHS we are considering so that this is the case. In this paper, polarizations will arise from Shklyarov's higher residue pairing on cyclic homology, which has degree 0 with respect to the standard grading.

Definition 2.4 A *morphism of pre*-VSHS is a degree-0 morphism of $\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$-modules $F : \mathcal{E}_1 \to \mathcal{E}_2$ which

- commutes with the connections; and

[2] More precisely, there is a map $u\nabla : T\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$, such that $u\nabla_X s$ is $\mathbb{K}$-linear in X, additive in s, satisfies the Leibniz rule
$$u\nabla_X(f \cdot s) = uX(f) \cdot s + f \cdot u\nabla_X s$$
for $f \in \mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$, and
$$[u\nabla_X, u\nabla_Y] = u^2\nabla_{[X,Y]}$$
for all $X, Y \in T\mathcal{M}$.

- if the pre-VSHS are polarized, we require that $(F(\alpha), F(\beta))_2 = (\alpha, \beta)_1$.

A morphism of Euler-graded pre-VSHS is required to satisfy

$$\mathsf{Gr}_2 \circ F = F \circ \mathsf{Gr}_1.$$

Definition 2.5 Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a pre-VSHS. Denote $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}} := \mathcal{E} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]} \mathbb{K}(\!(u)\!)$. The $\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$-submodule $\mathcal{E} \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$ equips $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$ with a decreasing filtration $F^{\geq \bullet}\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$: we define the filtration by

$$F^{\geq p}\widetilde{\mathcal{E}} := u^{\geq p} \cdot \mathcal{E}. \tag{1}$$

This is called the *Hodge filtration*. The connection satisfies *Griffiths transversality*:

$$\nabla(F^{\geq p}\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}) \subset F^{\geq p-1}\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}.$$

2.2 VSHS

Definition 2.6 An *unpolarized* VSHS is an unpolarized pre-VSHS which is furthermore

- *finite-rank*: i.e., $\mathcal{E}$ is a finitely-generated module over $\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$; and
- *free*: i.e., $\mathcal{E}$ is a free $\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$-module.

Definition 2.7 A *polarization* for a VSHS is a polarization for the underlying pre-VSHS, which is furthermore *non-degenerate*: i.e., the pairing of $\mathbb{K}$-modules

$$\mathcal{E}/u\mathcal{E} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathcal{E}/u\mathcal{E} \to \mathbb{K}$$

induced by $(\cdot,\cdot)$ is non-degenerate.

A morphism of VSHS (polarized or unpolarized) is the same thing as a morphism of the underlying pre-VSHS.

Remark 2.8 The terminology 'polarized' and 'unpolarized' is not standard: what we call a 'polarized VSHS' is usually simply called a VSHS. However, the notion of an unpolarized VSHS has applications in mirror symmetry so it seems useful to make the distinction.

2.3 Euler gradings

We have assumed that our VSHS are graded, in the usual sense that $\mathcal{E}$ is a direct sum of its graded pieces. A different notion of 'grading' for VSHS is used in the literature, which we do not adopt, because it would give rise to confusion regarding the usual terminology for A_∞ categories. Namely, if $\mathcal{C}$ is a graded A_∞ category (in the usual sense), then Theorem A (4) constructs a graded unpolarized pre-VSHS, in the sense of Definition 2.1.

Instead, we will use the term 'Euler grading' to refer to the alternative notion which is used in the literature, see e.g. [Bar01, CIT09].

Definition 2.9 An *Euler grading* on a pre-VSHS is a $\Bbbk$-linear endomorphism

$$\mathsf{Gr} : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E},$$

such that there is a vector field $E \in T\mathcal{M}$ (called the *Euler vector field*) satisfying

$$\mathsf{Gr}(f \cdot s) = (2u\partial_u + 2E)f \cdot s + f \cdot \mathsf{Gr}(s)$$

for all $f \in \mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$, as well as

$$[\mathsf{Gr}, \nabla_X] = \nabla_{[2E,X]},$$

and

$$(2u\partial_u + 2E)(s_1, s_2) = (\mathsf{Gr}(s_1), s_2) + (s_1, \mathsf{Gr}(s_2)).$$

Example 2.10 An $\mathbb{R}$-graded pre-VSHS admits an Euler grading, by setting

$$\mathsf{Gr}(s) := |s| \cdot s$$

for s pure of degree $|s|$. The Euler vector field $E \in T\mathcal{M}$ is the graded derivation $E : \mathbb{K} \to \mathbb{K}$ defined by the same formula as Gr, multiplied by $\frac{1}{2}$.

Remark 2.11 For any Euler-graded pre-VSHS, we can extend the connection ∇ to a flat connection that is also defined in the u-direction, by setting

$$\nabla_{u\frac{\partial}{\partial u}} := \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{Gr} - \nabla_E. \tag{2}$$

Remark 2.12 One can also extract an Euler graded VSHS from an A_∞ category $\mathcal{C}$, if one assumes that the category itself comes with an 'Euler grading'. Namely, one assumes that there is an Euler vector field E on the coefficient field $\mathbb{K}$, and that $\mathcal{C}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}/2$-graded $\mathbb{K}$-linear A_∞ category. Then an Euler grading on $\mathcal{C}$ is a map Gr on the morphism spaces of the category, compatible with the Euler vector field as in Definition 2.9, and such that the A_∞ structure maps μ^s satisfy

$$\mathsf{Gr} \circ \mu^s = \mu^s \circ \mathsf{Gr} + (2-s) \cdot \mu^s.$$

Our proof of Theorem A applies to the $\mathbb{Z}/2$-graded A_∞ category $\mathcal{C}$, to produce $\mathbb{Z}/2$-graded Hochschild invariants: and one easily checks that, if $\mathcal{C}$ comes with an Euler grading, then all of the Hochschild invariants admit Euler gradings, compatible with all structures. This is relevant when one studies mirror symmetry for Fano varieties, but not in the Calabi-Yau case – so we will not comment further on it in this paper.

3 Hochschild invariants of A_∞ categories

3.1 dg categories

We recall basic conventions for dg categories.

Definition 3.1 A $\mathbb{K}$-*linear* dg *category* $\mathcal{C}$ consists of:

- A set of objects $Ob(\mathcal{C})$.
- For each pair of objects, a graded $\mathbb{K}$-vector space $hom^\bullet(X,Y)$, equipped with a differential d of degree $+1$.
- Composition maps

$$\begin{aligned} hom^\bullet(X_1,X_2) \otimes hom^\bullet(X_0,X_1) &\to hom^\bullet(X_0,X_2) \\ f \otimes g &\mapsto f \cdot g \end{aligned}$$

of degree 0, such that

$$(f \cdot g) \cdot h = f \cdot (g \cdot h) \tag{3}$$

$$d(f \cdot g) = df \cdot g + (-1)^{|f|} f \cdot dg. \tag{4}$$

Example 3.2 Let R be a graded $\mathbb{K}$-algebra. There is a dg category $\mathsf{mod}\text{-}R$:

- Objects are cochain complexes $\{\ldots \to M_p \stackrel{d_M}{\to} M_{p+1} \to \ldots\}$ of R-modules.
- Morphisms are graded R-module homomorphisms:
$$hom^p_{\mathsf{mod}\text{-}R}(M_\bullet, N_\bullet) := \mathsf{Hom}^p_R(M_\bullet, N_\bullet).$$
- The differential is given by
$$d(f) := d_N \circ f + (-1)^{|f|'} f \circ d_M. \tag{5}$$
- Composition is composition of R-module homomorphisms: $f \cdot g := f \circ g$.

Definition 3.3 Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a dg category; we define the *opposite* dg *category* $\mathcal{C}^{op}$ with the same set of objects, by setting
$$\begin{aligned} hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{C}^{op}}(X,Y) &:= hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{C}}(Y,X). \\ d_{op}(x) &:= d(x). \\ f \cdot_{op} g &:= (-1)^{|f|\cdot|g|} g \cdot f. \end{aligned}$$

3.2 A_∞ categories

We follow the sign conventions of [Get93] and [Sei08a]. A pre-A_∞ category $\mathcal{C}$ consists of a set of objects, and a graded $\mathbb{K}$-vector space $hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{C}}(X,Y)$ for each pair of objects X, Y.

We define the convenient notation
$$\mathcal{C}(X_0,\ldots,X_s) := hom^\bullet(X_0,X_1)[1] \otimes \ldots \otimes hom^\bullet(X_{s-1},X_s)[1].$$
For a generator $(a_1,\ldots,a_s)$ of $\mathcal{C}(X_0,\ldots,X_s)$, we define the sign
$$\epsilon_j := |a_1|' + \ldots + |a_j|'.$$
We define the Hochschild cochains of length s:
$$CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C})^s := \prod_{X_0,\ldots,X_s} \mathsf{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{C}(X_0,\ldots,X_s), \mathcal{C}(X_0,X_s))[-1].$$
We then define the *Hochschild cochain complex*
$$CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) := \prod_{s\geq 0} CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C})^s$$
(more precisely, the completion of the direct sum in the category of graded vector spaces, with respect to the filtration by length s). It admits the *Gerstenhaber product*:
$$\varphi \circ \psi(a_1,\ldots,a_s) := \sum_{j,k} (-1)^{|\psi|'\cdot\epsilon_j} \varphi^*(a_1,\ldots,\psi^*(a_{j+1},\ldots),a_{k+1},\ldots).$$
An A_∞ structure on $\mathcal{C}$ is an element $\mu^* \in CC^2(\mathcal{C})$ satisfying $\mu^* \circ \mu^* = 0$ and $\mu^0 = 0$.

The *cohomology category* $H^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ has the same objects, morphism spaces
$$\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(X,Y) := H^\bullet(hom^\bullet(X,Y), \mu^1),$$
and composition maps given by
$$[a_1]\cdot[a_2] = (-1)^{|a_2|}\mu^2(a_2,a_1).$$
We will always assume that our A_∞ categories are *cohomologically unital*, i.e., the category $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(X,Y)$ has units.

Definition 3.4 If $\mathcal{C}$ is a dg category, we define an A_∞ category $A_\infty(\mathcal{C})$ with the same set of objects, by setting

$$\begin{aligned} hom^\bullet_{A_\infty(\mathcal{C})}(X,Y) &:= hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{C}}(Y,X). \\ \mu^1(f) &:= df. \\ \mu^2(f,g) &:= (-1)^{|f|} f \cdot g. \\ \mu^{\geq 3} &:= 0. \end{aligned}$$

If $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ is a dg functor, we define an A_∞ functor

$$A_\infty(F) : A_\infty(\mathcal{C}) \to A_\infty(\mathcal{D})$$

by setting $A_\infty(F)^1 := F$ and $A_\infty(F)^{\geq 2} := 0$.

Remark 3.5 In order to convert to an A_∞ category with the conventions used in [Sei08b], one keeps the same objects and *hom*-spaces, but defines

$$CC^\bullet_{new}(\mathcal{C})^s := \prod_{X_0,\ldots,X_s} \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(hom^\bullet(X_{s-1},X_s)[1] \otimes \ldots \otimes hom^\bullet(X_0,X_1)[1], hom^\bullet(X_0,X_s)).$$

One defines an isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) &\to CC^\bullet_{new}(\mathcal{C}) \\ \varphi^* &\mapsto \varphi^*_{new}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\varphi^s_{new}(a_s,\ldots,a_1) := \varphi^s(a_1,\ldots,a_s).$$

In particular, the A_∞ structure μ^*_{new} is defined by reversing the order of inputs in μ^*.

We recall that an A_∞ *functor* $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ consists of a map on the level of objects, together with maps

$$F^s : \mathcal{C}(X_0,\ldots,X_s) \to \mathcal{D}(FX_0,FX_s)$$

satisfying

$$\sum \mu^*(F^*(a_1,\ldots),F^*(a_{j_1+1},\ldots),\ldots,F^*(a_{j_k+1},\ldots,a_s)) = \sum (-1)^{\epsilon_j} F^*(a_1,\ldots,\mu^*(a_{j+1},\ldots),\ldots,a_s). \tag{6}$$

Definition 3.6 If $\mathcal{C}$ is an A_∞ category, we define the *opposite* A_∞ category $\mathcal{C}^{op}$. It has the same objects as $\mathcal{C}$, and morphism spaces

$$hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{C}^{op}}(X,Y) := hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{C}}(Y,X).$$

The A_∞ structure maps are defined by

$$\mu^s_{\mathcal{C}^{op}}(a_1,\ldots,a_s) := (-1)^\dagger \mu^s(a_s,\ldots,a_1),$$

where

$$\dagger := \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq s} |a_i|' \cdot |a_j|'.$$

If $e \in hom^0_{\mathcal{C}}(X,X)$ is a cohomological unit in $\mathcal{C}$, then $-e \in hom^0_{\mathcal{C}^{op}}(X,X) \cong hom^0_{\mathcal{C}}(X,X)$ is a cohomological unit in $\mathcal{C}^{op}$.

Remark 3.7 Observe that this is a different definition of the opposite A_∞ category from that given in [Sei08b, Section 1a]. It was verified in [She11, Appendix A] that there is an isomorphism $\mathcal{F}(X,\omega)^{op} \cong \mathcal{F}(X,-\omega)$ for the exact Fukaya category $\mathcal{F}$ (actually, the opposite category there was defined to have A_∞ structure maps $-\mu^*_{op}$; but that is isomorphic to the version given here by the strict A_∞ functor sending $x \mapsto (-1)^{|x|'}$). We take this as evidence that this definition of the opposite category is most relevant for Fukaya categories. We thank Seidel for drawing our attention to this difference.

Remark 3.8 Definitions 3.4, 3.3 and 3.6 are compatible, but in a slightly non-trivial way: given a dg category $\mathcal{C}$, there is a strict isomorphism of A_∞ categories

$$A_\infty(\mathcal{C}^{op}) \to (A_\infty(\mathcal{C}))^{op} \tag{7}$$

which sends $x \mapsto -x$ for all morphisms x.

3.3 Hochschild cohomology

We define the *Gerstenhaber bracket* on $CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$:

$$[\varphi,\psi] := \varphi\circ\psi - (-1)^{|\varphi|'\cdot|\psi|'}\psi\circ\varphi.$$

It is a graded Lie bracket. We define the *Hochschild differential* $M^1 : CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C})[1]$ by $M^1 := [\mu^*,-]$. Because $[\mu^*,\mu^*]=0$, M^1 is a differential, i.e., $(M^1)^2=0$. Its cohomology is called the Hochschild cohomology, $\mathsf{HH}^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$.

For $p \geq 2$, we define

$$M^p \in CC^2(CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C}), CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C}))^p$$

by

$$M^p(\varphi_1,\ldots,\varphi_p)(a_1,\ldots,a_s) := \tag{8}$$
$$\sum (-1)^\dagger \mu^*(a_1,\ldots,\varphi_1^*(a_{j_1+1},\ldots),\ldots,\varphi_p^*(a_{j_p+1},\ldots),\ldots,a_s)$$

where

$$\dagger = \sum_{i=1}^{p} |\varphi_i|'\cdot\epsilon_{j_i}.$$

By [Get93, Proposition 1.7], the operations $M^* \in CC^2(CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C}))$ define an A_∞ structure on $CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$. In particular, the *Yoneda product* on $\mathsf{HH}^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$, defined on the cochain level by

$$\varphi\cup\psi := (-1)^{|\varphi|'}M^2(\varphi,\psi),$$

makes $\mathsf{HH}^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ into a graded associative algebra.

3.4 Hochschild homology

We define the *Hochschild chain complex*

$$CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) := \bigoplus_{X_0,\ldots,X_s} \mathcal{C}(X_0,\ldots,X_s,X_0)[-1].$$

We denote generators by $a_0[a_1|\ldots|a_s] := a_0\otimes\ldots\otimes a_s$. For a generator $a_0[a_1|\ldots|a_s]$ of $CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$, we define the sign

$$\varepsilon_j := |a_0|' + |a_1|' + \ldots + |a_j|'$$

(the only difference between ϵ_j and ε_j is that the former starts at 1, the latter starts at 0).

We define an operation t on $CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ by

$$t(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) := (-1)^{|a_s|'\cdot\varepsilon_{s-1}} a_s[a_0|\dots|a_{s-1}].$$

Now we introduce some useful notation: if $P : CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to M$ is some map, we define

$$\begin{aligned} P(a_0[a_1|\dots|\overbrace{a_{j+1}|\dots|a_k}|\dots|a_s]) &:= \sum_{i=j+1}^{k} P \circ t^i \\ &= \sum_{i=j+1}^{k} (-1)^{\dagger} P(a_{s-i+1}[\dots|a_s|a_0|\dots|a_{s-i}]), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\dagger := (\varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_{s-i}) \cdot \varepsilon_{s-i}.$$

In words, we add up all ways of cyclically permuting the inputs of P, in such a way that a_0 lands underneath the brace.

We define the Hochschild differential $b : CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C})[1]$ by

$$b(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) := \sum_j \mu^*(\overbrace{a_0,\dots,a_j})[a_{j+1}|\dots|a_s] + \sum_{j,k} (-1)^{\varepsilon_j} a_0[\dots|\mu^*(a_{j+1},\dots,a_k)|\dots|a_s]. \tag{9}$$

It is a differential, and its cohomology is called the Hochschild homology, $\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$.

Remark 3.9 The convention for Hochschild homology of a dg category $\mathcal{C}$ (see, e.g., [Shk12, Equation (2.1)]) coincides with ours, i.e., there is a tautological identification of cochain complexes

$$(C_\bullet(\mathcal{C}), b) \equiv (CC_\bullet(A_\infty(\mathcal{C})), b).$$

Definition 3.10 There is an isomorphism of cochain complexes

$$CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}^{op})$$

which sends

$$a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s] \mapsto (-1)^{\dagger} a_0[a_s|\dots|a_1],$$

where

$$\dagger := \sum_{1\le i<j\le s} |a_i|' \cdot |a_j|'.$$

We denote it by $\alpha \mapsto \alpha^\vee$.

Remark 3.11 Definition 3.10 is compatible with the corresponding map for dg categories, in the sense that for any dg category $\mathcal{C}$, the following diagram commutes up to an overall sign -1:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) & \longrightarrow & CC_\bullet(A_\infty(\mathcal{C})) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ C_\bullet(\mathcal{C}^{op}) & \longrightarrow & CC_\bullet(A_\infty(\mathcal{C}^{op})). \end{array}$$

Here, the horizontal maps are the tautological identifications (see Remark 3.9), the left vertical arrow is the map defined, e.g., in [Shk12, Proposition 4.5], and the right vertical arrow is the map defined in Definition 3.10, composed with the isomorphism $CC_\bullet(A_\infty(\mathcal{C})^{op}) \cong CC_\bullet(A_\infty(\mathcal{C}^{op}))$ induced by the isomorphism (7).

For $p \geq 1$, we define the operations

$$b^{p|1} : CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C})^{\otimes p} \otimes CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C})[1-p]$$

by

$$b^{p|1}(\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_p | a_0, \ldots, a_s) := \sum (-1)^\dagger \mu^*(a_0, \ldots, \varphi_1^*(a_{j_1+1}, \ldots), \ldots, \varphi_p^*(a_{j_p+1}, \ldots), \overbrace{\ldots, a_k}) [\ldots | a_s] \tag{10}$$

where

$$\dagger = \sum_{i=1}^{p} |\varphi_i|' \cdot \varepsilon_{j_i}.$$

By [Get93, Theorem 1.9], the operations $b^{p|1}$ (with $b^{0|1} := b$) equip $CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ with the structure of an A_∞ left-module over the A_∞ algebra $CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$, i.e.,

$$\sum (-1)^\dagger b^{\bullet|1}(\varphi_1, \ldots | b^{\bullet|1}(\varphi_{j+1}, \ldots, \varphi_p | \alpha)) + \sum (-1)^\dagger b^{\bullet|1}(\varphi_1, \ldots, M^\bullet(\varphi_{j+1}, \ldots), \varphi_{k+1}, \ldots, \varphi_p | \alpha) = 0 \tag{11}$$

for all $\alpha \in CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$, where

$$\dagger = \sum_{i=1}^{j} |\varphi_i|'$$

(for both terms).

Remark 3.12 Getzler denotes $b^{p|1}$ by $b\{-, \ldots, -\}$.

In particular, $\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ is a graded left $\mathsf{HH}^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$-module, with the module structure given on the level of cohomology by

$$\varphi \cap \alpha := (-1)^{|\varphi|} b^{1|1}(\varphi | \alpha).$$

Remark 3.13 In order to convert to the conventions of [Abo10, Gan13] for $CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$, which follow the conventions of [Sei08b] for $CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ (compare Remark 3.5), one defines the isomorphism

$$\begin{array}{rcl} CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) & \to & CC_\bullet^{new}(\mathcal{C}), \\ a_0[a_1|\ldots|a_s] & \mapsto & (-1)^\dagger a_0[a_s|\ldots|a_1], \end{array}$$

where

$$\dagger := |a_0|' \cdot (\varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_0) + |a_0|.$$

Lemma 3.14 *If $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ is an A_∞ functor, there is a chain map*

$$F_* : CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to CC_\bullet(\mathcal{D})$$

defined by

$$F_*(a_0[\ldots|a_s]) := \sum F^*(\overbrace{a_0, \ldots}) [F^*(\ldots)| \ldots | F^*(\ldots, a_s)].$$

3.5 Kodaira-Spencer maps

For the purposes of this section, we denote $\mathbb{K}_\epsilon := \mathbb{K}[\epsilon]/\epsilon^2$. We recall that there is a map of $\mathbb{K}$-vector spaces

$$\mathsf{Der}_{\Bbbk}\,\mathbb{K} \to \mathsf{Hom}_{Alg}(\mathbb{K}, \mathbb{K}_\epsilon), \tag{12}$$

which sends the derivation v to the algebra homomorphism

$$k \mapsto k + \epsilon \cdot v(k).$$

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a $\mathbb{K}$-linear graded A_∞ category. We recall that graded first-order deformations of $\mathcal{C}$ correspond to elements α^* of $CC^2(\mathcal{C})$ which are closed: namely, α^* corresponds to the deformation $\mu^* + \epsilon \cdot \alpha^*$.

Definition 3.15 We define the Kodaira-Spencer map

$$\mathsf{KS} : \mathsf{Der}_{\Bbbk}\,\mathbb{K} \to \mathsf{HH}^2(\mathcal{C})$$

by sending derivation v to the class in $\mathsf{HH}^2(\mathcal{C})$ corresponding to the first-order deformation

$$\mathcal{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathbb{K}_\epsilon,$$

where $\mathbb{K}_\epsilon$ is regarded as a $\mathbb{K}$-algebra via the algebra map corresponding to v under (12). This is closely related to the *Kaledin class*, see [Kal07, Lun10].

Here is another way to think about the Kodaira-Spencer map:

Lemma 3.16 *Suppose we make a choice of $\mathbb{K}$-basis for each morphism space $hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{C}}(X,Y)$. We can write each A_∞ structure map μ^* in this basis, as a matrix with entries in $\mathbb{K}$. We obtain a Hochschild cochain $v(\mu^*) \in CC^2(\mathcal{C})$ by acting with the derivation v on the entries of the matrix for μ^*. It is closed, and is a cochain-level representative for $\mathsf{KS}(v)$.*

Proof To see that the Hochschild cochain $v(\mu^*) \in CC^2(\mathcal{C})$ is closed, one applies v to the A_∞ equations for $\mathcal{C}$.

Now let B and C be $\mathbb{K}$-vector spaces, and $F : B \to C$ a $\mathbb{K}$-linear map with matrix $[F_{ij}]$ with respect to bases $\{b_i\}$ for B and $\{c_j\}$ for C. We obtain a $\mathbb{K}_\epsilon$-basis $\{b_i \otimes 1\}$ for $B \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathbb{K}_\epsilon$, and similarly for C. Then the $\mathbb{K}_\epsilon$-linear map

$$F \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathbb{K}_\epsilon : B \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathbb{K}_\epsilon \to C \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathbb{K}_\epsilon$$

acts on basis elements as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} F(b_i \otimes 1) &= \sum_j (F_{ij} \cdot c_j) \otimes 1 \\ &= \sum_j c_j \otimes (F_{ij} + \epsilon v(F_{ij})) \\ &= \sum_j (F_{ij} + \epsilon v(F_{ij})) \cdot c_j \otimes 1. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, the matrix for $F \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathbb{K}_\epsilon$ is $[F] + \epsilon v([F])$.

Therefore, after choosing bases for the morphisms spaces of $\mathcal{C}$, the A_∞ structure maps $\mu^* \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathbb{K}_\epsilon$ have matrices $[\mu^*] + \epsilon v([\mu^*])$ with respect to these bases. In particular, the Hochschild cochain corresponding to the deformation, written in this basis, is precisely $v(\mu^*)$. □

Remark 3.17 We will make use of the cochain-level representative $v(\mu^*)$ for $\mathsf{KS}(v)$ in what follows; as is clear from Lemma 3.16, implicit in this notation is a choice of basis for all of the morphism spaces of $\mathcal{C}$.

3.6 Cyclic homology

If $\mathcal{C}$ is an A_∞ category, we define a new A_∞ category $\mathcal{C}^+$, by

$$hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{C}^+}(X,Y) := \begin{cases} hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{C}}(X,Y) & \text{if } X \neq Y \\ hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{C}}(X,X) \oplus \mathbb{K} \cdot e^+ & \text{if } X = Y. \end{cases}$$

We define

$$\mu^s(\ldots, e^+, \ldots) = 0$$

for all $s \neq 2$, and

$$\mu^2(e^+, a) = a = (-1)^{|a|}\mu^2(a, e^+)$$

(leaving all other structure maps μ^* unchanged). Then $\mathcal{C}^+$ is a strictly unital A_∞ category, with strict units e^+.

Remark 3.18 There is a strict isomorphism $(\mathcal{C}^{op})^+ \cong (\mathcal{C}^+)^{op}$, which sends $a \mapsto a$ for all $a \in \hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{C}}$, but sends $e^+ \mapsto -e^+$.

If $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ is an A_∞ functor, then we can extend F to an A_∞ functor $F^+ : \mathcal{C}^+ \to \mathcal{D}^+$ by setting $F^1(e^+) = e^+$ and

$$F^s(\ldots, e^+, \ldots) = 0$$

for all $s \geq 2$.

We define the subcomplex $D_\bullet \subset CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}^+)$ of *degenerate elements*, generated by $a_0[\ldots|a_s]$ such that $a_i = e^+$ for some $i > 0$, together with the length-zero chains e^+. We define the *non-unital Hochschild chain complex*,

$$CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) := CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}^+)/D_\bullet.$$

When $\mathcal{C}$ is cohomologically unital, the natural map

$$CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \hookrightarrow CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}^+) \to CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$$

is a quasi-isomorphism (compare [Lod98, Section 1.4]).

Remark 3.19 Observe that, if $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ is an A_∞ functor, then the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow{F_*} & CC_\bullet(\mathcal{D}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow{F^+_*} & CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{D}) \end{array}$$

commutes.

Now define Connes' differential $B : CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ by

$$B(a_0[\ldots|a_s]) := e^+[\overbrace{a_0|\ldots|a_s}]. \tag{13}$$

It has degree -1, and satisfies $B^2 = 0$ and $bB + Bb = 0$. Therefore, for any graded $\mathbb{K}[u]$-module W, where u has degree $+2$, we obtain a graded cochain complex $(CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \otimes W, b + uB)$.

Remark 3.20 The tautological identification of Hochschild complexes for a dg category, and for its A_∞ version (Remark 3.9) equates the dg version of Connes' differential (with conventions as in [Shk13, Section 2.2]) with the A_∞ version (13).

Definition 3.21 We recall (from Section 2.1) the automorphism of $\mathbb{K}[u]$ which sends $f \mapsto f^\star$, where

$$f^\star(u) := f(-u).$$

If W_1 and W_2 are $\mathbb{K}[u]$-modules, we call a map $g : W_1 \to W_2$ *sesquilinear* if

$$g(f \cdot w) = f^\star \cdot g(w).$$

Remark 3.22 Given a sesquilinear automorphism of W, also denoted $w \mapsto w^\star$, we obtain an isomorphism of cochain complexes

$$(CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \otimes W, b + uB) \cong (CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \otimes W, b - uB)$$

by sending $\alpha \otimes w \mapsto \alpha \otimes w^\star$. Thus, although Getzler uses the convention that the cyclic differential is $b - uB$ in [Get93], every formula he writes can be translated into our conventions by setting $u \mapsto -u$.

Remark 3.23 The isomorphism of Definition 3.10 extends to an isomorphism $CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \cong CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ which intertwines B with $-B$. This is a consequence of Remark 3.18: insertion of e^+ in $CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ corresponds to insertion of $-e^+$ in $CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}^{op})$.

Remark 3.24 As a consequence of the previous two remarks, for any $\mathbb{K}[u]$-module W, we obtain a sesquilinear isomorphism of cochain complexes

$$(CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \otimes W, b + uB) \to (CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}^{op}) \otimes W, b + uB) \tag{14}$$

$$\alpha \mapsto \alpha^\vee. \tag{15}$$

If a graded $\mathbb{K}[u]$-module W admits, furthermore, an exhaustive decreasing filtration $\ldots \supset F^{\geq p}W \supset F^{\geq p+1}W \supset \ldots$, such that multiplication by u increases the filtration: $u \cdot F^{\geq p} \subset F^{\geq p+1}$, then the cochain complex $(CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \otimes W, b + uB)$ admits an exhaustive decreasing filtration $CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \otimes F^{\geq p}W$; so we can take the completion of this filtration in the category of graded cochain complexes, to obtain a new filtered cochain complex $(CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})\widehat{\otimes}W, b + uB)$. The cohomology of this cochain complex will also acquire a filtration, which we call the *Hodge filtration* and denote by $F^{\geq p}$. The corresponding spectral sequence has E_1 page

$$E_1^{pq} \cong \bigoplus_r \mathsf{HH}_{p+q-r}(\mathcal{C}) \otimes \mathsf{Gr}^p W_r. \tag{16}$$

Lemma 3.25 *If $G : CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{D})$ is a map such that*

$$G \circ b = b \circ G \text{ and } G \circ B = B \circ G,$$

then we obtain a map of filtered cochain complexes:

$$G\widehat{\otimes}W : CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})\widehat{\otimes}W \to CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{D})\widehat{\otimes}W.$$

If G is a quasi-isomorphism, then $G\widehat{\otimes}W$ is a quasi-isomorphism.

Proof The existence of $G\widehat{\otimes}W$ is clear. Because $G\widehat{\otimes}W$ respects filtrations, it induces a map between the corresponding spectral sequences (17); because G is a quasi-isomorphism, the map is an isomorphism on the E_1 page. Therefore, because the filtrations are exhaustive and complete, $G\widehat{\otimes}W$ is a quasi-isomorphism by the Eilenberg-Moore comparison theorem [Wei94, Theorem 5.5.11]. □

Definition 3.26 The following examples are of particular interest:

- $W^- := \mathbb{K}[u]$, with filtration $F^{\geq p}W^- := u^p\mathbb{K}[u]$. We denote the corresponding cochain complex by
$$CC^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) := CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})\widehat{\otimes}W^-,$$
and its cohomology by $\mathsf{HC}^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$. This is called the *negative cyclic homology*.
- $W^\infty := \mathbb{K}[u,u^{-1}]$, with the same filtration. We denote the corresponding cochain complex by
$$CC^\infty_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) := CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})\widehat{\otimes}W^\infty,$$
and its cohomology by $\mathsf{HP}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$. This is called the *periodic cyclic homology*.
- $W^+ := \mathbb{K}[u,u^{-1}]/\mathbb{K}[u]$, with the same filtration. We denote the corresponding cochain complex by
$$CC^+_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) := CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})\widehat{\otimes}W^+,$$
and its cohomology by $\mathsf{HC}^+_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$. This is called the *positive cyclic homology*.
- $W = \mathbb{K}$, with trivial filtration. The corresponding cochain complex is $CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$, with cohomology $\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$.

Remark 3.27 For these examples, the spectral sequence (16) has E_1 page

$$E_1^{pq} \cong \begin{cases} \mathsf{HH}_{q-p}(\mathcal{C})\cdot u^p & \text{if } u^p \in W \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

Remark 3.28 As a consequence of Remark 3.24, there is a sesquilinear isomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{HC}^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) & \to & \mathsf{HC}^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C}^{op}), \\ \alpha & \mapsto & \alpha^\vee, \end{array}$$

and similarly for $\mathsf{HP}_\bullet$ and $\mathsf{HC}^+_\bullet$.

Lemma 3.29 *If $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ is an A_∞ functor, then the map $F^+_* : CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{D})$ satisfies*
$$F^+_* \circ b = b \circ F^+_* \text{ and } F^+_* \circ B = B \circ F^+_*.$$
In particular, it induces a map $F_* : \mathsf{HC}^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to \mathsf{HC}^-_\bullet(\mathcal{D})$, and similarly for $\mathsf{HP}_\bullet$ and $\mathsf{HC}^+_\bullet$.

Corollary 3.30 *If an A_∞ functor $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ induces an isomorphism $F_* : \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{D})$, then it also induces an isomorphism $F_* : \mathsf{HC}^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to \mathsf{HC}^-_\bullet(\mathcal{D})$, and similarly for $\mathsf{HP}_\bullet$ and $\mathsf{HC}^+_\bullet$.*

3.7 The Getzler-Gauss-Manin connection

Getzler [Get93] defines operations

$$B^{p|1} : CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C})^{\otimes p} \otimes CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to CC^{nu}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$$

by

$$B^{p|1}(\varphi_1,\dots,\varphi_p|a_0,\dots,a_s) := \sum (-1)^\dagger e^+[a_0|\dots|\varphi_1^*(a_{j_1+1},\dots)|\dots|\varphi_p^*(a_{j_p+1},\dots)|\overbrace{\dots|a_s}]$$

where

$$\dagger := \sum_{i=1}^p |\varphi_i|' \cdot \varepsilon_{j_i}.$$

In particular, $B^{0|1} = B$.

Remark 3.31 Getzler denotes $B^{p|1}$ by $B\{-,\dots,-\}$.

Definition 3.32 The Getzler-Gauss-Manin connection [Get93, Proposition 3.1] is defined on the cochain level by

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla : \mathrm{Der}_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} CC^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) &\to u^{-1} CC^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C}), \\ \nabla_v(\alpha) &:= v(\alpha) - u^{-1} b^{1|1}(v(\mu^*)|\alpha) - B^{1|1}(v(\mu^*)|\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the second term on the right-hand side has acquired a minus sign in our conventions, in accordance with Remark 3.22.

Remark 3.33 In writing the expressions '$v(\alpha)$' and '$v(\mu^*)$', it is implicit that we have chosen a $\mathbb{K}$-basis for each morphism space $hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{C}}(X,Y)$. So really we should write '$\nabla^{\mathcal{B}}$', where $\mathcal{B}$ denotes the choice of these bases; however we will prove (Corollary 3.36) that $\nabla^{\mathcal{B}}$ is independent of the choice of $\mathcal{B}$ on the level of cohomology, so $\mathcal{B}$ can be removed from the notation.

Remark 3.34 Observe that ∇_v induces a linear map $\mathsf{Gr}^p_F CC^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to \mathsf{Gr}^{p-1}_F CC^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$. This map is given by $b^{1|1}(\mathsf{KS}(v))$ on the level of cohomology, in analogy with the associated graded of the classical Gauss-Manin connection with respect to the Hodge filtration (see, e.g., [Voi02, Theorem 10.4]).

Getzler shows that $[\nabla^{\mathcal{B}}_v, b+uB] = 0$, so $\nabla^{\mathcal{B}}_v$ gives a well-defined map on the level of cohomology. It is clear from the formula that it is a connection. Getzler also shows that $\nabla^{\mathcal{B}}$ is flat: more precisely, he writes down an explicit contracting homotopy for

$$u^2 \left([\nabla_X, \nabla_Y] - \nabla_{[X,Y]} \right)$$

(see [Get93, Theorem 3.3]), so the connection is flat in the sense of Definition 2.1.

Next we prove that $\nabla^{\mathcal{B}}$ is natural with respect to A_∞ functors:

Theorem 3.35 *Suppose that $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are A_∞ categories, equipped with a choice of $\mathbb{K}$-bases $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{C}}$ for the morphism spaces of $\mathcal{C}$, and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{D}}$ for the morphism spaces of $\mathcal{D}$. If $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ is an A_∞ functor, then the induced map*

$$F_* : \mathsf{HC}^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to \mathsf{HC}^-_\bullet(\mathcal{D})$$

respects the Getzler-Gauss-Manin connection, in the sense that

$$F_* \circ \left[\nabla^{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{C}}}_v\right] = \left[\nabla^{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{D}}}_v\right] \circ F_*$$

on the level of cohomology.

Proof See Appendix B. □

Corollary 3.36 *The Getzler-Gauss-Manin connection $\nabla^{\mathcal{B}}$ is independent of the choice of bases $\mathcal{B}$, on the level of cohomology.*

Proof Follows from Theorem 3.35, taking F to be the identity functor. □

Henceforth, we simply write '∇' instead of '$\nabla^{\mathcal{B}}$'. It follows that, for any graded $\mathbb{K}$-linear A_∞ category $\mathcal{C}$, $(\mathsf{HC}^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C}), \nabla)$ is a well-defined unpolarized pre-VSHS.

4 Bimodules

4.1 Morita equivalence

We recall some material about A_∞ bimodules from [Sei08a, Section 2]. If $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are A_∞ categories, we denote by $[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}]$ the dg category of graded, $\mathbb{K}$-linear, cohomologically unital A_∞ $(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$ bimodules. Recall: morphisms are 'pre-homomorphisms' of bimodules; the differential is given by [Sei08a, Equation (2.8)]; composition is given by [Sei08a, Equation (2.9)].

Recall that if $\mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are A_∞ categories, and $\mathcal{M}$ is an A_∞ $(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$ bimodule, then there is an induced dg functor

$$? \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{M} : [\mathcal{B},\mathcal{C}] \to [\mathcal{B},\mathcal{D}]. \tag{18}$$

If $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{C}_\Delta$ is the diagonal bimodule, then the functor $? \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{C}_\Delta$ is quasi-isomorphic to the identity functor.

Definition 4.1 $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are *Morita equivalent* if there exists a $(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$ bimodule $\mathcal{M}$, and a $(\mathcal{D},\mathcal{C})$ bimodule $\mathcal{N}$, and quasi-isomorphisms of A_∞ bimodules

$$\mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N} \cong \mathcal{C}_\Delta$$

and

$$\mathcal{N} \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{M} \cong \mathcal{D}_\Delta.$$

We say that $\mathcal{M}$ *defines a Morita equivalence* between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$.

If $\mathcal{M}$ defines a Morita equivalence between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$, then the functor (18) is a quasi-equivalence.

We now recall an important equivalent formulation of Morita equivalence. We define $\mathrm{tw}^\pi\,\mathcal{C}$ to be the triangulated split-closure of $\mathcal{C}$ (denoted '$\prod(Tw(\mathcal{C}))$' in [Sei08b, Section 4c]). The following result is well-known; we present a proof in Appendix A.

Theorem 4.2 *$\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are Morita equivalent if and only if $\mathrm{tw}^\pi\,\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathrm{tw}^\pi\,\mathcal{D}$ are quasi-equivalent.*

4.2 Hochschild cohomology

Generalizing [Gan13, Equation (2.200)] slightly, we have the following:

Lemma 4.3 *There is an A_∞ homomorphism*

$$L^*_{\mathcal{M}} : CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to hom^\bullet_{A_\infty([\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}])}(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{M}), \tag{19}$$

given by the formula

$$L^p_{\mathcal{M}}(\varphi_1,\ldots,\varphi_p)(a_1,\ldots,a_s,m,b_1,\ldots,b_t) := \tag{20}$$
$$\sum (-1)^\dagger \mu^*_{\mathcal{M}}(a_1,\ldots,\varphi_1^*(a_{j_1+1},\ldots),\ldots,\varphi_p^*(a_{j_p+1},\ldots),\ldots,a_1,m,b_1,\ldots,b_t)$$

where

$$\dagger = \sum_{i=1}^{p} |\varphi_i|' \cdot \epsilon_{j_i}.$$

Proof The A_∞ homomorphism equations for $L^*_{\mathcal{M}}$ are a consequence of the A_∞ bimodule equations for $\mathcal{M}$. □

We will also need a version of Lemma 4.3 for the action of $CC^\bullet(\mathcal{D})$ on the right of $\mathcal{M}$. For that, we need:

Lemma 4.4 *There is an A_∞ homomorphism*

$$R^*_{\mathcal{M}} : CC^\bullet(\mathcal{D})^{op} \to hom^\bullet_{A_\infty([\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}])}(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{M}), \tag{21}$$

given by the formula

$$R^p_{\mathcal{M}}(\varphi_1,\ldots,\varphi_p)(a_1,\ldots,a_s,m,b_1,\ldots,b_t) := \tag{22}$$
$$\sum (-1)^\dagger \mu^*_{\mathcal{M}}(a_1,\ldots,a_s,m,b_1,\ldots,\varphi^*_p(y_{j_p+1},\ldots),\ldots,\varphi^*_1(y_{j_1+1},\ldots),\ldots,y_t)$$

where

$$\dagger = \sum_{i<j} |\varphi_i|' \cdot |\varphi_j|' + \sum_{i=1}^{p} |\varphi_i|' \cdot \delta_{j_i},$$

where we introduce the new sign abbreviation

$$\delta_j := |a_1|' + \ldots + |a_s|' + |m| + |b_1|' + \ldots + |b_j|'.$$

Lemma 4.5 *The chain maps*

$$L^1_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}, R^1_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta} : CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to hom^\bullet_{A_\infty([\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}])}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta,\mathcal{C}_\Delta)$$

are chain-homotopic.

Proof The homotopy is given by

$$H(\varphi)^{s|1|t}(a_1,\ldots,a_s,m,b_1,\ldots,b_t) := \varphi(a_1,\ldots,a_s,m,b_1,\ldots,b_t).$$

□

Lemma 4.6 *([Gan13, Proposition 2.5]) $L^1_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}$ and $R^1_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}$ are quasi-isomorphisms. As a consequence, on the cohomology level, we have isomorphisms of algebras*

$$\mathsf{HH}^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \cong \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet_{[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}]}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta,\mathcal{C}_\Delta) \cong \mathsf{HH}^\bullet(\mathcal{C})^{op}.$$

In particular, the algebra $\mathsf{HH}^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ is graded commutative (compare [Ger63]).

Lemma 4.7 *The following diagram of chain maps commutes up to homotopy:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow{L^1_{\mathcal{M}}} & hom^\bullet_{[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}]}(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{M}) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle R^1_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathcal{C}_\Delta\otimes ?} \\ hom^\bullet_{[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}]}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta,\mathcal{C}_\Delta) & \xrightarrow{?\otimes_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{M}} & hom^\bullet_{[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}]}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta\otimes_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{M},\mathcal{C}_\Delta\otimes_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{M}). \end{array} \tag{23}$$

Proof The homotopy $H : CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to hom^\bullet_{[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}]}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta\otimes_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{M},\mathcal{C}_\Delta\otimes_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{M})$ is defined by

$$H(\varphi^*)^{0|1|0}(a_0,a_1,\ldots,a_s,m) := \sum (-1)^\dagger (a_0,a_1,\ldots,\varphi^*(a_{j+1},\ldots),\ldots,a_s,m)$$

where

$$\dagger := |\varphi|' \cdot \varepsilon_j.$$

(note that $H(\varphi^*)$ has no higher-order terms). □

Remark 4.8 One might expect that the commutativity up to homotopy of the diagram in Lemma 4.7 could be upgraded to commutativity up to homotopy of A_∞ morphisms, but we have not done this.

Lemma 4.9 *If $\mathcal{M}$ defines a Morita equivalence between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$, then $L^1_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $R^1_{\mathcal{M}}$ are quasi-isomorphisms.*

Proof We prove that $L^1_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a quasi-isomorphism. Consider the commutative diagram (23). $R^1_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}$ is a quasi-isomorphism by Lemma 4.6. $\mathcal{C}_\Delta \otimes ?$ is a quasi-isomorphism because it is quasi-isomorphic to the identity functor. $? \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{M}$ is a quasi-isomorphism because $\mathcal{M}$ defines a Morita equivalence. Therefore, $L^1_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a quasi-isomorphism. The proof that $R^1_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a quasi-isomorphism is analogous. □

Corollary 4.10 *(Morita invariance of Hochschild cohomology). If $\mathcal{M}$ defines a Morita equivalence between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$, there are A_∞ quasi-isomorphisms*

$$CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \xrightarrow{L_{\mathcal{M}}} hom^\bullet_{[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}]}(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{M}) \xleftarrow{R_{\mathcal{M}}} CC^\bullet(\mathcal{D})^{op}. \tag{24}$$

Recalling that $CC^\bullet(\mathcal{D})^{op}$ is quasi-isomorphic to $CC^\bullet(\mathcal{D})$ by Lemma 4.6, this shows that $CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ and $CC^\bullet(\mathcal{D})$ are quasi-isomorphic as A_∞ algebras. Taking cohomology, we obtain an isomorphism of graded commutative $\mathbb{K}$-algebras

$$\mathsf{F} : \mathsf{HH}^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathsf{HH}^\bullet(\mathcal{D}). \tag{25}$$

Of course, the result of Corollary 4.10 can be obtained more efficiently than we have done. Given Lemma 4.6, we know that $CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \cong hom^\bullet_{[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}]}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta, \mathcal{C}_\Delta)$. If $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are Morita equivalent, then the categories $[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}]$ and $[\mathcal{D},\mathcal{D}]$ are quasi-equivalent, and the equivalence sends the diagonal bimodule $\mathcal{C}_\Delta$ to the diagonal bimodule $\mathcal{D}_\Delta$, up to quasi-isomorphism; hence the endomorphism algebras of these diagonal bimodules in their respective categories are quasi-isomorphic as A_∞ algebras. The main point of this section has been to obtain explicit formulae for the isomorphism on the chain level, because we will need them in Section 4.4.

4.3 Hochschild homology

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a graded A_∞ category, and $\mathcal{M}$ a $(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C})$ bimodule. Following [Sei08a, Section 5], we can define the Hochschild chain complex $CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{M})$ as a cyclic tensor product:

$$CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{M}) := \mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} cyc.$$

The Hochschild homology of $\mathcal{M}$ is the cohomology of this cochain complex, and we denote it $\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{M})$ (in Section 3.4, we only considered $\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) := \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}_\Delta)$).

By functoriality of the cyclic tensor product, the chain complex

$$CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) := \mathcal{C}_\Delta \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} cyc.$$

is a left dg module (and an A_∞ left-module, by a sign change) over $hom^\bullet_{[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}]}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta,\mathcal{C}_\Delta)$. We recall that, given an A_∞ functor $F : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ and an A_∞ left-module $\mathcal{M}$ over $\mathcal{B}$, we can define the pullback A_∞ left-module $F^*\mathcal{M}$ over $\mathcal{A}$ (see [Gan13, Section 2.8]).

Lemma 4.11 *Pulling back by the A_∞ quasi-isomorphism*

$$L^*_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta} : CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to hom^\bullet_{A_\infty([\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}])}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta,\mathcal{C}_\Delta)$$

of the previous section, we equip $CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ with an A_∞ left-module structure over $CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$. This coincides (strictly) with the A_∞ left-module structure $b^{*|1}$ of Section 3.4.

Lemma 4.12 *(Morita invariance of Hochschild homology) If $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are Morita equivalent A_∞ categories, and*

$$\mathsf{F} : \mathsf{HH}^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathsf{HH}^\bullet(\mathcal{D})$$

is the algebra isomorphism of (25), then there is an isomorphism of $\mathsf{HH}^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$-modules

$$\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \cong \mathsf{F}^* \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{D}). \tag{26}$$

Proof Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a $(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$ bimodule and $\mathcal{N}$ a $(\mathcal{D},\mathcal{C})$ bimodule which define a Morita equivalence between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$. We have the following chain of quasi-isomorphisms, in which we regard each term as having a module structure over the endormorphism algebra of a certain bimodule, which we have overlined, and that the quasi-isomorphisms respect the module structures (this includes the case that the quasi-isomorphism is the identity map, but the endomorphism algebra we are considering changes):

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\mathcal{C}}_\Delta \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} cyc. &\cong \overline{\mathcal{C}}_\Delta \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{C}_\Delta \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} cyc. \\
&\cong \overline{\mathcal{C}}_\Delta \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N} \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} cyc. \\
&\cong \overline{\mathcal{C}_\Delta \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{M}} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N} \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} cyc. \\
&\cong \mathcal{C}_\Delta \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \overline{\mathcal{M}} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N} \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} cyc. \\
&\cong \overline{\mathcal{M}} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N} \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} cyc. \\
&\cong \mathcal{N} \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \overline{\mathcal{M}} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} cyc.
\end{aligned}$$

For the first line, we apply Lemma 4.13 below. For the third line, we recall the (strict) quasi-isomorphism of A_∞ algebras

$$hom^\bullet_{[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}]}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta, \mathcal{C}_\Delta) \xrightarrow{?\otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{M}} hom^\bullet_{[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}]}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C}_\Delta \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{M}).$$

For the fourth line, we recall the (strict) quasi-isomorphism of A_∞ algebras

$$hom^\bullet_{[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}]}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C}_\Delta \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{M}) \xleftarrow{\mathcal{C}_\Delta \otimes ?} hom^\bullet_{[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}]}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}).$$

We now apply the same reasoning to $\mathcal{D}$, and conclude that we have quasi-isomorphisms

$$\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \cong H^\bullet(\mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N} \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} cyc.) \cong \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{D}) \tag{27}$$

which respect the module structure on the level of cohomology, relative to the algebra isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet_{[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}]}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta, \mathcal{C}_\Delta) \to \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet_{[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}]}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}) \leftarrow \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet_{[\mathcal{D},\mathcal{D}]}(\mathcal{D}_\Delta, \mathcal{D}_\Delta).$$

Now recall that the $\mathsf{HH}^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$-module structure on $\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ is obtained by pulling back the $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet_{[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}]}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta, \mathcal{C}_\Delta)$-module structure via the isomorphism $L^1_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}$ or $R^1_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}$ (the result is the same by Lemma 4.5). Applying the commutative diagram (23) twice (once for $\mathcal{C}$ and once for $\mathcal{D}$), we conclude that the isomorphisms (27) respect module structures relative to the algebra isomorphisms

$$\mathsf{HH}^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet_{[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}]}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}) \leftarrow \mathsf{HH}^\bullet(\mathcal{D})$$

appearing in Corollary 4.10. □

Lemma 4.13 *Observe that, if $\mathcal{M}$ is a $(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$ bimodule, then $\mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{D}_\Delta \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} cyc.$ and $\mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} cyc.$ are modules over $hom^\bullet_{[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}]}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M})$, by functoriality of the cyclic tensor product in $\mathcal{M}$. Furthermore, we have a quasi-isomorphism of bimodules $\mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{D}_\Delta \to \mathcal{M}$, and hence a quasi-isomorphism*

$$\mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{D}_\Delta \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} cyc. \to \mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} cyc. \tag{28}$$

This map is a quasi-isomorphism of $hom^\bullet_{[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}]}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M})$-modules.

Proof The homotopy is defined by

$$H : hom^{\bullet}_{[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}]}(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{M}) \otimes (\mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{D}_{\Delta} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} cyc.) \to \mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} cyc.,$$

(29) $$H(\rho, m[a_1|\dots|a_s]c[b_1|\dots|b_t]) := \sum (-1)^{\dagger} \rho(b_{j+1},\dots,b_t,m,a_1,\dots,a_s,c,b_1,\dots)[\dots|b_j],$$

where

$$\dagger = (|b_{j+1}|' + \dots + |b_t|') \cdot (|m| + |a_1|' + \dots + |a_s|' + |c| + |b_1|' + \dots + |b_j|).$$

□

Lemma 4.14 *If $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ is an A_∞ functor, so that the $(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$ bimodule*

$$\mathcal{M} := (F \otimes \mathrm{Id})^* \mathcal{D}_{\Delta}$$

and the $(\mathcal{D},\mathcal{C})$ bimodule

$$\mathcal{N} := (\mathrm{Id} \otimes F)^* \mathcal{D}_{\Delta}$$

define a Morita equivalence between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ (compare Lemma A.3), then the induced isomorphism (26) coincides with the map F_* defined in Lemma 3.14.

Proof The key point is to check that the maps

$$\mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N} \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} cyc. \to \mathcal{D}_{\Delta} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} cyc.$$

given by

(30) $$m[b_1|\dots|b_t]n[a_1|\dots|a_s] \mapsto \sum \mu^*(b_{j+1},\dots,b_t,n,F^*(a_1,\dots),\dots,F^*(\dots,a_s),m,b_1,\dots)[b_{k+1}|\dots|b_j]$$

and

(31) $$m[b_1|\dots|b_t]n[a_1|\dots|a_s] \mapsto \sum \mu^*(\dots,F^*(\dots,a_s),m,b_1,\dots,b_t,n,F^*(a_1,\dots),\dots)[F^*(a_{k+1},\dots)|\dots|F^*(\dots,a_j)]$$

are chain homotopic. The chain homotopy is given by

$$H(m[b_1|\dots|b_t]n[a_1|\dots|a_s]) := m[b_1|\dots|b_t|n|F^*(a_1,\dots)|\dots|F^*(\dots,a_s)].$$

□

Corollary 4.15 $\mathsf{HC}^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C}), \mathsf{HP}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ *and* $\mathsf{HC}^+_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ *are Morita invariants. So is the Getzler-Gauss-Manin connection.*

Proof Suppose $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are Morita equivalent. It follows by Theorem 4.2 that we have A_∞ functors

$$\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow \mathsf{tw}^{\pi}\,\mathcal{C} \to \mathsf{tw}^{\pi}\,\mathcal{D} \hookleftarrow \mathcal{D}.$$

Each of these induces a map on Hochschild and cyclic homology, by Lemmas 3.14 and 3.29. Furthermore, the maps on Hochschild homology coincide with the corresponding maps (26), by Lemma 4.14; so they are isomorphisms, by Lemma 4.12.

Therefore, the induced maps on cyclic homology are isomorphisms, by Corollary 3.30: furthermore, they respect the Getzler-Gauss-Manin connections, by Theorem 3.35. □

4.4 Kodaira-Spencer maps

Proposition 4.16 *If $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are Morita-equivalent $\mathbb{K}$-linear A_∞ categories, then the isomorphism of Hochschild cohomologies (25) respects Kodaira-Spencer maps (see Definition 3.15).*

Proof Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a $(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$ bimodule which defines a Morita equivalence between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$. We consider the quasi-isomorphisms of (24):

$$CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \xrightarrow{L^1_{\mathcal{C}}} hom^\bullet_{A_\infty([\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}])}(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{M}) \xleftarrow{R^1_{\mathcal{D}}} CC^\bullet(\mathcal{D})^{op},$$

which induce the algebra isomorphism (25). Given a derivation $v \in \mathrm{Der}_{\mathbb{k}}\,\mathbb{K}$, and choosing a basis for the morphisms spaces of $\mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{M}$, we can write

$$L^1_{\mathcal{C}}(v(\mu^*_{\mathcal{C}}))(a_1,\dots,a_s,m,b_1,\dots,b_t) = \sum (-1)^{\epsilon_j}\mu^*_{\mathcal{M}}(a_1,\dots,v(\mu^*_{\mathcal{C}})(a_{j+1},\dots),\dots,x_s,m,b_1,\dots,b_t)$$

and

$$R^1_{\mathcal{D}}(v(\mu^*_{\mathcal{D}}))(a_1,\dots,a_s,m,b_1,\dots,b_t) = \sum (-1)^{\delta'_j}\mu^*_{\mathcal{M}}(a_1,\dots,a_s,m,b_1,\dots,v(\mu^*_{\mathcal{D}})(b_{j+1},\dots),\dots,b_t).$$

We also have the A_∞ bimodule equations for $\mathcal{M}$:

$$\begin{aligned}(32)\quad 0 = &\sum (-1)^{\epsilon_j}\mu^*_{\mathcal{M}}(a_1,\dots,\mu^*_{\mathcal{M}}(a_{j+1},\dots,a_s,m,b_1,\dots),\dots,b_t)\\ &+\sum (-1)^{\epsilon_j}\mu^*_{\mathcal{M}}(a_1,\dots,\mu^*_{\mathcal{C}}(a_{j+1},\dots),\dots,a_s,m,b_1,\dots,b_t)\\ &+\sum (-1)^{\delta_j}\mu^*_{\mathcal{M}}(a_1,\dots,a_s,m,b_1,\dots,\mu^*_{\mathcal{D}}(b_{j+1},\dots),\dots,b_t).\end{aligned}$$

If we apply the derivation v to this equation, we obtain (by the product rule, cancelling all terms involving $v(a_i)$ or $v(b_j)$ by the A_∞ relations)

$$\begin{aligned}(33)\quad 0 = &\sum (-1)^{\epsilon_j}v(\mu^*_{\mathcal{M}})(a_1,\dots,\mu^*_{\mathcal{M}}(a_{j+1},\dots,a_s,m,b_1,\dots),\dots,b_t)\\ &+\sum (-1)^{\epsilon_j}\mu^*_{\mathcal{M}}(a_1,\dots,v(\mu^*_{\mathcal{M}})(a_{j+1},\dots,a_s,m,b_1,\dots),\dots,b_t)\\ &+\sum (-1)^{\epsilon_j}v(\mu^*_{\mathcal{M}})(a_1,\dots,\mu^*_{\mathcal{C}}(a_{j+1},\dots),\dots,a_s,m,b_1,\dots,b_t)\\ &+\sum (-1)^{\epsilon_j}\mu^*_{\mathcal{M}}(a_1,\dots,v(\mu^*_{\mathcal{C}})(a_{j+1},\dots),\dots,a_s,m,b_1,\dots,b_t)\\ &+\sum (-1)^{\delta_j}v(\mu^*_{\mathcal{M}})(a_1,\dots,a_s,m,b_1,\dots,\mu^*_{\mathcal{D}}(b_{j+1},\dots),\dots,b_t)\\ &+\sum (-1)^{\delta_j}\mu^*_{\mathcal{M}}(a_1,\dots,a_s,m,b_1,\dots,v(\mu^*_{\mathcal{D}})(b_{j+1},\dots),\dots,b_t).\end{aligned}$$

This can be written as

$$0 = \partial(v(\mu^*_{\mathcal{M}})) + L^1_{\mathcal{C}}(v(\mu^*_{\mathcal{C}})) - R^1_{\mathcal{D}}(v(\mu^*_{\mathcal{D}})),$$

therefore $L^1_{\mathcal{C}}(v(\mu^*_{\mathcal{C}})) = R^1_{\mathcal{D}}(v(\mu^*_{\mathcal{D}}))$ on the level of cohomology, and the result follows. □

5 Pairings on Hochschild and cyclic homology

5.1 The Mukai pairing for dg categories

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a $\mathbb{K}$-linear dg category. We recall a construction due to Shklyarov [Shk12].

There is a natural notion of tensor product of $\mathbb{K}$-linear dg categories, and there is a Künneth quasi-isomorphism of Hochschild chain complexes

$$C_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \otimes C_\bullet(\mathcal{D}) \to C_\bullet(\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D}) \tag{34}$$

(see [Shk12, Theorem 2.8]).

If $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are dg categories, then a dg $(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$ bimodule $\mathcal{Q}$ consists of:

- For each pair $(X,Y) \in Ob(\mathcal{C}) \times Ob(\mathcal{D})$, a graded $\mathbb{K}$-vector space $\mathcal{Q}^\bullet(X,Y)$ equipped with a differential d of degree $+1$.
- Left-module maps

$$\begin{aligned} hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{C}}(X_1,X_2) \otimes \mathcal{Q}^\bullet(X_0,X_1) &\to \mathcal{Q}^\bullet(X_0,X_2) \\ f \otimes q &\mapsto f \cdot q \end{aligned}$$

  and right-module maps

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}^\bullet(X_1,X_2) \otimes hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{D}}(X_0,X_1) &\to \mathcal{Q}^\bullet(X_0,X_2) \\ q \otimes g &\mapsto q \cdot g \end{aligned}$$

satisfying the obvious analogues of the Leibniz rule (4) and associativity (3).

Example 5.1 The diagonal $(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C})$ bimodule $\mathcal{C}_\Delta$ has:

$$\mathcal{C}^\bullet_\Delta(X,Y) := hom^\bullet(X,Y)$$

as a cochain complex, with the obvious differential and left- and right-module maps.

A dg $(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$ bimodule $\mathcal{P}$ is equivalent to a dg functor

$$\mathcal{P} : \mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D}^{op} \to \text{mod-}\mathbb{K}.$$

On the level of objects, the functor sends

$$(X,Y) \mapsto \mathcal{P}^\bullet(X,Y).$$

To define the functor on the level of morphisms, we first define, for any $c \in hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{C}}(X_1,X_2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} L(c) : \mathcal{P}(X_0,X_1) &\to \mathcal{P}(X_0,X_2), \\ p &\mapsto c \cdot p. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for any $d \in hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{D}}(X_0,X_1)$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} R(d) : \mathcal{P}(X_1,X_2) &\to \mathcal{P}(X_0,X_2), \\ p &\mapsto (-1)^{|p|\cdot|d|} p \cdot d. \end{aligned}$$

We now define the functor on the level of morphisms:

$$\mathcal{P}(c \otimes d) := L(c) \circ R(d).$$

By functoriality of Hochschild homology, a dg $(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$ bimodule $\mathcal{P}$ induces a chain map

$$C_\bullet(\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D}^{op}) \to C_\bullet(\text{mod-}\mathbb{K}).$$

Pre-composing this with the Künneth quasi-isomorphism (34) gives another chain map, which induces a map on cohomology

$$\wedge_{\mathcal{P}} : \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \otimes \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{D}^{op}) \to \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathbb{K}). \tag{35}$$

Now we consider the full dg sub-category $\mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K} \subset \mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathbb{K}$, whose objects are the cochain complexes with finite-dimensional cohomology. There is an obvious dg functor

$$\mathbb{K} \hookrightarrow \mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K}$$

given by including the full subcategory with the single object $\mathbb{K}[0]$, and this induces an isomorphism of Hochschild homologies:

$$\mathbb{K} \cong \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathbb{K}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K}). \tag{36}$$

The inverse to this isomorphism is denoted

$$\int : \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathbb{K}, \tag{37}$$

and is called the 'Feigin-Losev-Shoikhet trace' in [Shk12].

Definition 5.2 We call a dg $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ bimodule $\mathcal{P}$ *proper* if $\mathcal{P}(X, Y) \in \mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K}$ for all $(X, Y) \in Ob(\mathcal{C}) \times Ob(\mathcal{D})$. A proper bimodule induces a pairing

$$\begin{aligned} C_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \otimes C_\bullet(\mathcal{D}^{op}) &\to \mathbb{K} \\ \alpha \otimes \beta &\mapsto \int \wedge_{\mathcal{P}}(\alpha, \beta). \end{aligned}$$

If $\mathcal{C}$ is a proper dg category, we call the pairing

$$\begin{aligned} \langle , \rangle_{Muk} : \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \otimes \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) &\to \mathbb{K}, \\ \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle_{Muk} &:= \int \wedge_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}(\alpha, \beta^\vee) \end{aligned}$$

the *Mukai pairing*.

Shklyarov shows that the Mukai pairing is Morita invariant.

Lemma 5.3 *Let* $\mathsf{fin}\mathbb{K} \subset \mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K}$ *denote the full subcategory whose objects are the finite-dimensional cochain complexes. There is a chain map*

$$\mathsf{Str} : C_\bullet(\mathsf{fin}\mathbb{K}) \to \mathbb{K}$$

which sends

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 &\mapsto \mathsf{str}(a_0), \\ a_0[a_1|\dots|a_n] &\mapsto 0 \text{ for } n \geq 1, \end{aligned}$$

where 'str*' on the first line denotes the supertrace*[3]*. It induces a map* $\mathsf{Str} : \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathsf{fin}\mathbb{K}) \to \mathbb{K}$*; this coincides with the composition*

$$\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathsf{fin}\mathbb{K}) \to \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K}) \xrightarrow{\int} \mathbb{K}.$$

[3] If V is a graded $\mathbb{K}$-vector space, and $F \in \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{K}}(V)$ an endomorphism, we define $\mathsf{str}(F)$ as follows: write F as a sum of components $F_{pq} \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{K}}(V_p, V_q)$, then

$$\mathsf{str}(F) := \sum_p (-1)^p \mathrm{tr}(F_{pp}).$$

Proof One easily verifies that Str is a chain map. The inclusion $\mathsf{fin}\mathbb{K} \hookrightarrow \mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K}$ is a quasi-equivalence, so induces an isomorphism of Hochschild homologies. It is obvious that Str is left-inverse to the map induced by the inclusion (36), and the result follows. □

Shklyarov derives the following formula for $\wedge_{\mathcal{P}}$: if $\alpha = a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s] \in C_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ and $\beta = b_0[b_1|\dots|b_t] \in C_\bullet(\mathcal{D}^{op})$, then

$$\wedge_{\mathcal{P}}(\alpha,\beta) = (-1)^{|b_0|\cdot(|a_1|'+\dots+|a_s|')} L(a_0)R(b_0)\mathsf{sh}_{st}[L(a_1)|\dots|L(a_s)|R(b_1)|\dots|R(b_t)]. \tag{38}$$

Here, sh_{st} denotes the sum of all (s,t)-shuffles of the elements in the square brackets, with the associated Koszul signs (where interchanging $L(a_i)$ with $R(b_j)$ introduces a sign $|a_i|'\cdot|b_j|'$). To clarify: the symbols '$L(a_i)$' and '$R(b_j)$' in (38) are regarded as morphisms in the dg category $\mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathbb{K}$.

5.2 A_∞ multifunctors

We introduce a notion of A_∞ multifunctors (compare [Lyu12]).

Definition 5.4 Let $\mathcal{C}_1,\dots,\mathcal{C}_n$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be A_∞ categories. An *A_∞ n-functor*

$$F : \mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_n \dashrightarrow \mathcal{D}$$

consists of:

- A map on objects:
$$F : Ob(\mathcal{C}_1) \times \dots \times Ob(\mathcal{C}_n) \to Ob(\mathcal{D}).$$
- $\mathbb{K}$-linear maps
$$F^{s_1;\dots;s_n} : \mathcal{C}_1(X_1^1,\dots,X_{s_1}^1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{C}_n(X_1^n,\dots,X_{s_n}^n) \to \mathcal{D}(F(X_1^1,\dots,X_1^n), F(X_{s_1}^1,\dots,X_{s_n}^n))$$
of degree 0, such that $F^{0;0;\dots;0} = 0$, and satisfying the *A_∞ n-functor relations:*
$$\sum_{i,j,k} (-1)^{\dagger} F^{s_1;\dots;s_i+1-k;\dots;s_n}(c_1^1,\dots,c_{s_1}^1;\dots;c_1^i,\dots,\mu^k_{\mathcal{C}_i}(c_j^i,\dots),c_{j+k+1}^i,\dots,c_{s_i}^i;c_1^n,\dots,c_{s_n}^n)$$
$$= \sum_{k,i_{p,q}} (-1)^{\maltese} \mu^k_{\mathcal{D}}(F(c_1^1,\dots,c_{i_{1,1}}^1;\dots;c_1^n,\dots,c_{i_{n,1}}^n),\dots,F(c_{i_{1,k}+1}^1,\dots,c_{i_{n,k}+1}^n)). \tag{39}$$
The sign $\dagger$ is the Koszul sign obtained by commuting $\mu^k_{\mathcal{C}_i}$ (equipped with degree 1) to the front of the expression (where each c_q^p is equipped with its reduced degree $|c_q^p|'$). We henceforth adopt the convention, in expressions involving A_∞ multifunctors, that $(-1)^{\maltese}$ is the Koszul sign associated to re-ordering the inputs c_q^p in the expression so that they appear in the order $(c_1^1,\dots,c_{s_1}^1;\dots;c_1^n,\dots,c_{s_n}^n)$ (still equipping the c_q^p with their reduced degrees).

If $\mathcal{C}_i$ is strictly unital, we say that F is *strictly unital in the ith entry* if

$$F^{s_1;\dots;s_n}(\dots;a_1^i,\dots,e^+,\dots,a_{s_i}^i;\dots) = \begin{cases} e^+ & \text{if } s_j = 0 \text{ for all } j \neq i, \text{ and } s_i = 1; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Example 5.5 Let $\mathcal{C}_1,\dots,\mathcal{C}_n$ be strictly unital dg categories, and $\mathcal{C}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{C}_n$ their tensor product dg category. Then there is an A_∞ n-functor

$$F : A_\infty(\mathcal{C}_1) \times \dots \times A_\infty(\mathcal{C}_n) \dashrightarrow A_\infty(\mathcal{C}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{C}_n),$$

with

$$F^{0;\dots;1;\dots;0}(;\dots;c_i;\dots;) := e_1 \otimes \dots \otimes e_{i-1} \otimes c_i \otimes e_{i+1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_n,$$

and all other $F^{*;\dots;*}$ vanishing.

Definition 5.6 Suppose that we have A_∞ categories

$$\mathcal{C}_1^1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_{t_1}^1, \mathcal{C}_1^2, \dots, \mathcal{C}_{t_2}^2, \dots, \mathcal{C}_1^m, \dots, \mathcal{C}_{t_m}^m,$$
$$\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_m,$$
$$\text{and } \mathcal{E},$$

and A_∞ multifunctors

$$F_i : \mathcal{C}_1^i \times \ldots \times \mathcal{C}_{t_i}^i \dashrightarrow \mathcal{D}_i$$

and

$$G : \mathcal{D}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{D}_m \dashrightarrow \mathcal{E}.$$

We define the composition

$$H := G \circ (F_1, \dots, F_n) : \mathcal{C}_1^1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{C}_{t_m}^m \dashrightarrow \mathcal{E}.$$

It acts on objects in the obvious way, and on morphisms by analogy with composition of A_∞ functors:

$$H^{s_{1,1},\dots,s_{1,t_1},\dots,s_{m,1},\dots,s_{m,t_m}}(c_1^{1,1}, \dots, c_{s_{1,1}}^{1,1}; \dots; c_1^{m,t_m}, \dots, c_{s_{m,t_m}}^{m,t_m}) := \tag{40}$$
$$\sum (-1)^{\maltese} G\left(F_1^*(c_1^{1,1}, \dots; \dots; c_1^{1,t_1}, \dots), \dots, F_1^*(\dots; \dots, c_{s_{1,t_1}}^{1,t_1}); \dots; F_m^*(\dots), \dots, F_m^*(\dots; \dots, c_{s_{m,t_m}}^{m,t_m})\right)$$

The check that the maps H^* satisfy the A_∞ multifunctor equations is straightforward. It is also easy to check that composition is 'associative' in the obvious sense.

Lemma 5.7 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be $\mathbb{K}$-linear A_∞ categories, and $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}]$ the* dg *category of A_∞ $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ bimodules. There is an A_∞ tri-functor*

$$F : A_\infty([\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}]) \times \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D}^{op} \dashrightarrow A_\infty(\text{mod-}\mathbb{K}),$$

defined on the level of objects by

$$F(\mathcal{P}, X, Y) := \left(\mathcal{P}(X, Y), \mu_{\mathcal{P}}^{0|1|0}\right),$$

and on the level of morphisms as follows:

- *For $(c_1, \dots, c_s; d_1, \dots, d_t) \in \mathcal{C}(X_1, \dots, X_s) \otimes \mathcal{D}^{op}(Y_1, \dots, Y_t)$, we define*
$$F^{0;s;t}(; c_1, \dots, c_s; d_1, \dots, d_t) \in \mathsf{Hom}_{\text{mod-}\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{P}(X_s, Y_t), \mathcal{P}(X_1, Y_1))$$
to be the morphism which sends
$$p \mapsto (-1)^{\dagger} \mu_{\mathcal{P}}(c_1, \dots, c_s; p; d_t, \dots, d_1),$$
for any $\mathcal{P}$, where
$$\dagger := \sum_{j<k} |d_j|' \cdot |d_k|' + |p| \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{t} |d_j|'.$$
- *For $(\rho; c_1, \dots, c_s; d_1, \dots, d_t) \in A_\infty([\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}])(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2) \otimes \mathcal{C}(X_1, \dots, X_s) \otimes \mathcal{D}^{op}(Y_1, \dots, Y_t)$, we define*
$$F^{1;s;t}(\rho; c_1, \dots, c_s; d_1, \dots, d_t) \in \mathsf{Hom}_{\text{mod-}\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{P}_2(X_s, Y_t), \mathcal{P}_1(X_1, Y_1))$$
to be the morphism which sends
$$p \mapsto (-1)^{\dagger} \rho(c_1, \dots, c_s, p, d_t, \dots, d_1),$$
where
$$\dagger := |\rho| + \sum_{j<k} |d_j|' \cdot |d_k|' + |p| \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{t} |d_j|'.$$

F is strictly unital in its first entry.

Lemma 5.8 *Let $G : \mathcal{C}_1 \to \mathcal{D}_1$ and $H : \mathcal{C}_2 \to \mathcal{D}_2$ be A_∞ functors. Then there is a* dg *functor*

$$(G \otimes H)^* : [\mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{D}_2] \to [\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{D}_1].$$

It is given on the level of objects by defining $(G \otimes H)^* \mathcal{P}$ to be the $(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{D}_1)$ bimodule with

$$(G \otimes H)^* \mathcal{P}(X, Y) := \mathcal{P}(GX, HY),$$

and structure maps

$$\mu^{s|1|t}_{(G\otimes H)^*\mathcal{P}}(c_1, \ldots, c_s, p, d_t, \ldots, d_1) := \sum \mu^{*|1|*}_{\mathcal{P}}(G(c_1, \ldots), \ldots, G(\ldots, c_s), p, H(d_t, \ldots), \ldots, H(\ldots, d_1)). \tag{41}$$

It is given on the level of morphisms by mapping the bimodule pre-homomorphism ρ to the bimodule pre-homomorphism $(G \otimes H)^* \rho$, given by the same formula (41), but with '$\mu_{\mathcal{P}}$' replaced by 'ρ'.

Lemma 5.9 *Let $G : \mathcal{C}_1 \to \mathcal{D}_1$ and $H : \mathcal{C}_2 \to \mathcal{D}_2$ be A_∞ functors, and denote by*

$$F_i : A_\infty([\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i]) \times \mathcal{C}_i \times \mathcal{D}_i \dashrightarrow A_\infty(\mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathbb{K})$$

the A_∞ tri-functor introduced in Lemma 5.7, for $i = 1, 2$. Then we have an equality

$$F_2 \circ (\mathsf{Id}, G, H^{op}) = F_1 \circ (A_\infty((G \otimes H)^*), \mathsf{Id}, \mathsf{Id})$$

of A_∞ tri-functors

$$A_\infty([\mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{D}_2]) \times \mathcal{C}_1 \times \mathcal{D}_1^{op} \dashrightarrow A_\infty(\mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathbb{K}).$$

Lemma 5.10 *Suppose that $\mathcal{C}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{C}_n$ are A_∞ categories, and $\mathcal{D}$ is an A_∞ category such that $\mu^{\geq 3}_{\mathcal{D}} = 0$, and*

$$F : \mathcal{C}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{C}_n \dashrightarrow \mathcal{D}$$

is an A_∞ n-functor. Then there is an induced chain map

$$F_* : CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}_1) \otimes \ldots \otimes CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}_n) \to CC_\bullet(\mathcal{D}),$$

defined by

$$F_*(c_0^1[c_1^1|\ldots|c_{s_1}^1], \ldots, c_0^n[c_1^n|\ldots|c_{s_n}^n]) := \sum (-1)^{✠+\dagger} \mu^2_{\mathcal{D}} \left(\ldots \left(\mu^2_{\mathcal{D}} \left(F^* \overbrace{(\ldots)}^{1}, F^* \overbrace{(\ldots)}^{2} \right), \ldots \right), F^* \overbrace{(\ldots)}^{n} \right) \left[F^*(\ldots), \ldots, F^*(\ldots) \right]. \tag{42}$$

To clarify the notation: the first term is obtained by taking n terms, and combining them with $n-1$ applications of $\mu^2_{\mathcal{D}}$ into a single term. The overbraces signify that we sum over all cyclic permutations of the inputs c^i_j such that c^i_0 lands underneath the overbrace labelled i. As usual, ✠ is the Koszul sign associated to re-ordering the inputs c^p_q: this includes the Koszul signs associated with the cyclic re-ordering associated with the overbrace notation, exactly as in Section 3.4. The other contribution to the overall sign is

$$\dagger := \frac{n(n-1)}{2} + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n, 1 \leq k \leq s_j} (n-j)|c^j_k|'.$$

Lemma 5.11 *The maps induced by Lemma 5.10 are compatible with composition of A_∞ multifunctors, i.e., in the setting of Definition 5.6, we have*

$$H_* = G_* \circ ((F_1)_* \otimes \ldots \otimes (F_n)_*)$$

Lemma 5.12 *In the situation of Example 5.5, the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} CC_\bullet(A_\infty(\mathcal{C}_1)) \otimes \ldots \otimes CC_\bullet(A_\infty(\mathcal{C}_n)) & \xrightarrow{=} & C_\bullet(\mathcal{C}_1) \otimes \ldots \otimes C_\bullet(\mathcal{C}_n) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle F_*} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathsf{sh}} \\ CC_\bullet(A_\infty(\mathcal{C}_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{C}_n)) & \xrightarrow{=} & C_\bullet(\mathcal{C}_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{C}_n) \end{array}$$

commutes. Here, F_* is the map induced by the A_∞ n-functor F introduced in Example 5.5, in accordance with Lemma 5.10. The other vertical map 'sh' is the natural generalization of the Künneth quasi-isomorphism (34).

5.3 The Mukai pairing for A_∞ bimodules

Definition 5.13 If X is an object of a cohomologically unital A_∞ category $\mathcal{C}$, then the cohomological unit $e_X \in hom^\bullet(X,X)$ defines a Hochschild cycle; we call the corresponding class in Hochschild homology the *Chern character of X*, and denote it $\mathsf{Ch}(X) \in \mathsf{HH}_0(\mathcal{C})$.

Lemma 5.14 *If X and Y are quasi-isomorphic objects of $\mathcal{C}$, then $\mathsf{Ch}(X) = \mathsf{Ch}(Y)$.*

Proof Let $[f] \in \mathsf{Hom}^0(X,Y)$ and $[g] \in \mathsf{Hom}^0(Y,X)$, so that

$$[f] \cdot [g] = [e_Y], \quad [g] \cdot [f] = [e_X].$$

Then

$$\mu^2(f,g) = e_X + \mu^1(h_X), \quad \mu^2(g,f) = e_Y + \mu^1(h_Y),$$

so

$$b(f[g] - h_X + h_Y) = e_X - e_Y,$$

so the classes $[e_X]$ and $[e_Y]$ are cohomologous. □

Definition 5.15 Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be A_∞ categories, and denote by

$$F_* : \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(A_\infty([\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}])) \otimes \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \otimes \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{D}^{op}) \to \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\text{mod-}\mathbb{K})$$

the map induced by the A_∞ tri-functor F introduced in Lemma 5.7, in accordance with Lemma 5.10. We define the pairing

$$\wedge_{\mathcal{P}} : \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \otimes \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{D}^{op}) \to \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\text{mod-}\mathbb{K})$$

by setting

$$\wedge_{\mathcal{P}}(\alpha,\beta) := F_*(\mathsf{Ch}(\mathcal{P}),\alpha,\beta).$$

Definition 5.15 is compatible with the corresponding notion in the dg world (35). To see how, we must first say how to turn a dg bimodule into an A_∞ bimodule:

Definition 5.16 Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be $\mathbb{K}$-linear dg categories, and $\mathcal{P}$ a dg $(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$ bimodule. We define an $(A_\infty(\mathcal{C}),A_\infty(\mathcal{D}))$ bimodule $A_\infty(\mathcal{P})$:

$$\begin{aligned} A_\infty(\mathcal{P})(X,Y) &:= \mathcal{P}(Y,X) \\ \mu^{0|1|0} &:= d_{\mathcal{P}} \\ \mu^{1|1|0}(c,p) &:= c\cdot p \\ \mu^{0|1|1}(p,d) &:= (-1)^{|p|'}p\cdot d \\ \mu^{s|1|t} &:= 0 \text{ for all } s+t\geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.17 If $\mathcal{P}$ is the diagonal $(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C})$ bimodule, then $A_\infty(\mathcal{P})$ is tautologically isomorphic to the diagonal $(A_\infty(\mathcal{C}),A_\infty(\mathcal{C}))$ bimodule (as defined in [Sei08a, Equation (2.20)]).

Lemma 5.18 *If $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are* dg *categories, and $\mathcal{P}$ is a* dg *$(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$ bimodule, then the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})\otimes\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{D}^{op}) & \longrightarrow & \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(A_\infty(\mathcal{C}))\otimes\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(A_\infty(\mathcal{D})^{op}) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \wedge_{\mathcal{P}}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \wedge_{A_\infty(\mathcal{P})}} \\ \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathbb{K}) & \longrightarrow & \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(A_\infty(\mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathbb{K})) \end{array}$$

commutes. Here, the top arrow is the tautological isomorphism $\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})\cong\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(A_\infty(\mathcal{C}))$, tensored with the isomorphism $\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{D}^{op})\cong\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(A_\infty(\mathcal{D})^{op})$ induced by (7).

Proof The diagram commutes on the level of cochain complexes: this follows by comparing Shklyarov's formula (38) with our own definition. □

Definition 5.19 Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a proper A_∞ category. We define the *Mukai pairing*

$$\langle,\rangle_{Muk} : \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})\otimes\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})\to\mathbb{K}$$

to be

$$\langle\alpha,\beta\rangle_{Muk} := -\int \wedge_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}(\alpha,\beta^\vee) \tag{43}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_\Delta$ is the diagonal bimodule, $\wedge$ is as in Definition 5.15, $\int$ denotes the Feigin-Losev-Shoikhet trace (which we can apply because $\mathcal{C}_\Delta$ is proper), and $\beta^\vee$ is the image of β under the isomorphism of Definition 3.10.

Proposition 5.20 (Morita invariance of Mukai pairing) *Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be proper A_∞ categories which are Morita equivalent. Then the isomorphism $\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})\cong\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{D})$ of Lemma 4.12 respects Mukai pairings.*

Proof By Theorem 4.2, we have A_∞ functors

$$\mathcal{C}\hookrightarrow \mathsf{tw}^\pi\,\mathcal{C}\to\mathsf{tw}^\pi\,\mathcal{D}\hookleftarrow\mathcal{D},$$

each of which induces an isomorphism on Hochschild homology: so it suffices to prove that each of these functors respects the Mukai pairings. It follows immediately, by combining Lemma 5.9 with Lemma 5.11, that

$$\wedge_{(F\otimes F)^*\mathcal{D}_\Delta}(\alpha,\beta)=\wedge_{\mathcal{D}_\Delta}(F_*\alpha,F_*\beta).$$

It follows from the proof of Lemma A.3 that, if F is cohomologically full and faithful and its image split-generates $\mathcal{D}$ (as is the case for each of the above functors), then $(F\otimes F)^*\mathcal{D}_\Delta$ is quasi-isomorphic

to $\mathcal{C}_\Delta$ in $[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}]$. It follows by Lemma 5.14 that their Chern characters coincide, so it is obvious from Definition 5.15 that

$$\wedge_{(F\otimes F)^*\mathcal{D}_\Delta} = \wedge_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}.$$

Composing with the Feigin-Losev-Shoikhet trace completes the proof. □

Proposition 5.21 *If $\mathcal{C}$ is a proper* dg *category, then our definition of the Mukai pairing on $\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(A_\infty(\mathcal{C})) \cong \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ (i.e., Definition 5.19) coincides with that given by Shklyarov (i.e., Definition 5.2).*

Proof Follows immediately from Lemma 5.18, together with Remarks 5.17 and 3.11 (the discrepancy between the dg and A_∞ versions of the isomorphism $\vee$ is the reason for the minus sign in (43)). □

Proposition 5.22 *If $\mathcal{C}$ is an A_∞ category with finite-dimensional hom-spaces (i.e., finite-dimensional on the cochain level, not just on the cohomology level), then the Mukai pairing is induced by the following chain-level map: if $\alpha = a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]$ and $\beta = b_0[b_1|\dots|b_t]$, then*

$$\langle \alpha,\beta\rangle_{Muk} = \sum_{j,k} \mathsf{tr}\left(c \mapsto (-1)^\dagger \mu^*(\overbrace{a_0,\dots,a_j}, \mu^*(a_{j+1},\dots,a_s,c,\overbrace{b_0,\dots,b_k}), b_{k+1},\dots,b_t)\right) \tag{44}$$

where

$$\dagger = \sum_{i=j+1}^{s} |a_i|' + |c|\cdot|\beta|.$$

To clarify (44): if the expression is not composable in $\mathcal{C}$, we set the summand to be 0. 'c' represents an element in the corresponding hom-space of $\mathcal{C}$.

Proof By our assumption that $\mathcal{C}$ has finite-dimensional *hom*-spaces, $\wedge_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}$ lands in $CC_\bullet(\mathsf{fin}\mathbb{K})$. Therefore, we have

$$\int \wedge_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}(\alpha,\beta^\vee) = \mathsf{Str}\left(\wedge_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}(\alpha,\beta^\vee)\right),$$

by Lemma 5.3. This yields (44). □

Example 5.23 If $\mathcal{C}$ is an A_∞ category with finite-dimensional *hom*-spaces, then (44) implies immediately that for any $X, Y \in Ob(\mathcal{C})$, we have

$$\langle \mathsf{Ch}(X), \mathsf{Ch}(Y)\rangle_{Muk} = \chi(\mathsf{Hom}^\bullet(X,Y))$$

(by applying the formula to $\alpha = e_X$ and $\beta = e_Y$, and observing that $\mu^2(e_X,\mu^2(a,e_Y)) = (-1)^{|a|}a$). Hence, the same holds for any proper A_∞ category, by the homological perturbation lemma and Morita invariance.

We recall that a (dg or) A_∞ category $\mathcal{C}$ is called *smooth* (or *homologically smooth*) if the diagonal bimodule $\mathcal{C}_\Delta$ is *perfect*, i.e., split-generated by tensor products of Yoneda modules (see [KS08]). It is not difficult to show that, if $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are quasi-equivalent categories, then $\mathcal{C}$ is smooth if and only if $\mathcal{D}$ is.

Proposition 5.24 *If $\mathcal{C}$ is a proper and smooth A_∞ category, then the Mukai pairing is non-degenerate.*

Proof The result was proved for dg categories in [Shk12, Theorem 1.4]. Any A_∞ category is quasi-equivalent to a dg category via the Yoneda embedding, so the result follows by Proposition 5.20. □

5.4 Higher residue pairing on dg categories

We recall the definition of the higher residue pairing given in [Shk13]. We recall that Shklyarov's definition of cyclic homology for dg categories is compatible with our convention for A_∞ categories (see Remark 3.20).

If $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are dg categories, then there is a Künneth map of cochain complexes, extending (34):

$$C_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C}) \otimes C_\bullet^-(\mathcal{D}) \to C_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D}), \tag{45}$$

and similarly for the other versions of cyclic homology (see [Shk13, Proposition 2.5]).

Remark 5.25 This map induces an isomorphism

$$\mathsf{HP}_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \otimes \mathsf{HP}_\bullet(\mathcal{D}) \cong \mathsf{HP}_\bullet(\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D})$$

on periodic cyclic homology. It need not induce an isomorphism on negative cyclic homology.

As before, a dg $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ bimodule $\mathcal{P}$ induces a dg functor $\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D}^{op} \to \mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathbb{K}$; composing this with the Künneth map (45) yields a map

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{P}} : C_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C}) \otimes C_\bullet^-(\mathcal{D}^{op}) \to C_\bullet^-(\mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathbb{K}). \tag{46}$$

Because the inclusion $\mathbb{K} \hookrightarrow \mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K}$ induces a quasi-isomorphism of Hochschild chain complexes, it also induces a quasi-isomorphism of cyclic homology complexes, by Corollary 3.30. We therefore obtain a quasi-isomorphism of cochain complexes:

$$C_\bullet^-(\mathbb{K}) \to C_\bullet^-(\mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K}).$$

We know that $\mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathbb{K}) \cong \mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$ (c.f. [Lod98, (2.1.12)]), so we obtain an isomorphism on the level of cohomology:

$$\widetilde{\int} : \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K}) \to \mathbb{K}[\![u]\!], \tag{47}$$

the 'cyclic Feigin-Losev-Shoikhet trace' (and similarly for periodic cyclic homology, where the map is to $\mathbb{K}(\!(u)\!)$, and positive cyclic homology, where the map is to $\mathbb{K}[u, u^{-1}]/\mathbb{K}[u]$).

The $\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$-linear extension of the map Str defined in Lemma 5.3 defines a chain map

$$\widetilde{\mathsf{Str}} : CC_\bullet^-(\mathsf{fin}\mathbb{K}) \to \mathbb{K}[\![u]\!].$$

The same argument as given in the proof of Lemma 5.3 shows that the induced map on the level of cohomology coincides with the map

$$\mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathsf{fin}\mathbb{K}) \to \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K}) \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\int}} \mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$$

(similarly for the periodic and positive versions).

Definition 5.26 If $\mathcal{C}$ is a proper dg category, we define the *higher residue pairing*, which is the pairing

$$\langle , \rangle_{res} : \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C}) \times \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C}) \to \mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$$

defined by

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle_{res} := \widetilde{\int} \tilde{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}(\alpha, \beta^\vee).$$

The pairing is *sesquilinear*, in the sense that it is additive in both inputs, and

$$\langle f \cdot \alpha, g \cdot \beta \rangle_{res} = f \cdot g^\star \cdot \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle_{res}$$

for all $f, g \in \mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$. We obtain similar pairings on $\mathsf{HP}_\bullet$ and $\mathsf{HC}_\bullet^+$.

Remark 5.27 Because the Künneth quasi-isomorphism for negative cyclic homology (45) extends that for Hochschild homology (34), and because the cyclic Feigin-Losev-Shoikhet trace (47) extends the non-cyclic version (37), the higher residue pairing extends the Mukai pairing, in the sense that

$$G\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle_{res} \equiv \langle G\alpha, G\beta \rangle_{Muk},$$

where on the left-hand side, $G : \mathbb{K}[\![u]\!] \to \mathbb{K}$ is the map setting $u = 0$, and on the right-hand side, $G : \mathsf{HC}^-_\bullet \to \mathsf{HH}_\bullet$ is the map induced on Hochschild complexes.

5.5 Higher residue pairing for A_∞ bimodules

Definition 5.28 Let $F : \mathcal{C}_1 \times \mathcal{C}_2 \times \mathcal{C}_3 \dashrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be an A_∞ tri-functor, where $\mu^{\geq 3}_{\mathcal{D}} = 0$. We define a $\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$-linear map

$$F'_* : CC^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C}_1) \otimes CC^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C}_2) \otimes CC^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C}_3) \to CC^-_\bullet(\mathcal{D})$$

as a sum of three maps: $F'_* := F1 + F2 + F3$. For $\alpha = a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]$, $\beta = b_0[b_1|\dots|b_t]$, $\gamma = c_0[c_1|\dots|c_u]$, we define

(48) $F1(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) :=$

$$\sum (-1)^{\maltese + \dagger + |\beta|'} e^+ [F^*(a_0, \dots; b_0, \dots; c_0, \dots)| \dots |\mu^2_{\mathcal{D}}(F^*(\overbrace{\dots}^{1}), F^*(\overbrace{\dots}^{2}))|F^*(\dots)| \dots |F^*(\overbrace{\dots}^{3})| \dots |F^*(\dots)],$$

where $\maltese$ is Koszul sign associated to re-ordering the inputs a_i, b_j, c_k as before (ignoring e^+), and $\dagger$ is the Koszul sign associated to commuting $\mu^2_{\mathcal{D}}$ (equipped with sign 1) to the front of the expression, where all F^* have degree 0, all a_i, b_j, c_k have their reduced degrees, and e^+ has degree 0.

We define

(49) $F2(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) :=$

$$\sum (-1)^{\maltese + |\beta|} F^*(\overbrace{a_0, \dots; b_0, \dots; c_0, \dots}^{3})[F^*(\dots)| \dots |F(\overbrace{\dots}^{1})| \dots |F(\overbrace{\dots}^{2})| \dots |F^*(\dots)].$$

We define

(50) $F3(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) :=$

$$\sum (-1)^{\maltese + |\beta|} F^*(\overbrace{a_0, \dots; b_0, \dots; c_0, \dots}^{1,3})[F^*(\dots)| \dots |F(\overbrace{\dots}^{2})| \dots |F^*(\dots)].$$

Lemma 5.29 *Let $F : \mathcal{C}_1 \times \mathcal{C}_2 \times \mathcal{C}_3 \dashrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be an A_∞ tri-functor, where $\mu^{\geq 3}_{\mathcal{D}} = 0$. Then there is a $\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$-linear chain map*

$$\widetilde{F}_* : CC^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C}_1) \otimes CC^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C}_2) \otimes CC^-_\bullet(\mathcal{C}_3) \to CC^-_\bullet(\mathcal{D})$$

(the tensor products are over $\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$), defined by

$$\widetilde{F}_* := F_* + uF'_*,$$

where F_* is as in Lemma 5.10 (in the case $n = 3$), and F'_* is as in Definition 5.28. The analogous results also hold for the periodic and positive versions of cyclic homology.

Proof In order to prove that

$$\widetilde{F}_* \circ (b + uB) = (b + uB) \circ \widetilde{F}_*,$$

it suffices to prove that:

- $F_* \circ b = b \circ F_*$ (we proved this in Lemma 5.10);
- $F'_* \circ b + F_* \circ B = b \circ F'_* + B \circ F_*$;
- $F'_* \circ B = B \circ F'_*$.

Each of these is a trivial check using the graphical notation of Appendix C; we omit the details. □

Definition 5.30 As in Definition 5.13, any object X of an A_∞ category $\mathcal{C}$ has an associated 'cyclic Chern character'

$$\widetilde{\mathsf{Ch}}(X) \in \mathsf{HC}_0^-(\mathcal{C})$$

(similarly for periodic and positive versions). Quasi-isomorphic objects have the same cyclic Chern character. If $\mathcal{C}$ is strictly unital, the Chern character has a particularly simple cochain-level representative. Namely, in the presence of strict units, we can define the Connes differential (and all other operations we have considered so far) using the strict units e in place of e^+. This gives the *unital cyclic complex*

$$((CC_\bullet/D_\bullet)\widehat{\otimes}W, b + uB).$$

In the unital cyclic complex, $\widetilde{\mathsf{Ch}}(X)$ is represented on the cochain level by the length-0 cycle e_X.

Remark 5.31 We do not give a proof of the assertions made in Definition 5.30, but they are standard: in fact, one can show that $\widetilde{\mathsf{Ch}}(X)$ depends only on the class of $[X] \in K_0(\mathcal{C})$ (compare [Sei13, Lemma 8.4]).

Definition 5.32 Let $\mathcal{P}$ be an A_∞ $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ bimodule. We define a $\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$-linear pairing

$$\widetilde{\wedge}_{\mathcal{P}} : \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C}) \otimes_{\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]} \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathcal{D}^{op}) \to \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(A_\infty(\mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathbb{K})),$$

by setting

$$\widetilde{\wedge}_{\mathcal{P}}(\alpha, \beta) := \widetilde{F}_* \left(\widetilde{\mathsf{Ch}}(\mathcal{P}), \alpha, \beta \right),$$

where $F : A_\infty([\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}]) \times \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D}^{op} \dashrightarrow A_\infty(\mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathbb{K})$ is the A_∞ tri-functor of Lemma 5.7, and $\widetilde{F}_*$ is the induced map, in accordance with Lemma 5.29.

Lemma 5.33 *Definition 5.32 is compatible with the corresponding definition in the* dg *world, i.e., the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C}) \otimes \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathcal{D}^{op}) & \longrightarrow & \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(A_\infty(\mathcal{C})) \otimes \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(A_\infty(\mathcal{D})^{op}) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \widetilde{\wedge}_{\mathcal{P}}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \widetilde{\wedge}_{A_\infty(\mathcal{P})}} \\ \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathbb{K}) & \longrightarrow & \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(A_\infty(\mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathbb{K})). \end{array}$$

Here, the horizontal arrows are the tautological identifications (or the isomorphism induced by the functor (7), in the case of $\mathcal{D}^{op}$). The left vertical map is the map (46), and the right vertical map is the map introduced in Definition 5.32.

Proof The diagram commutes on the level of cochain complexes. □

Definition 5.34 Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a proper A_∞ category. We define the *higher residue pairing*

$$\langle , \rangle_{res} : \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C}) \times \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C}) \to \mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$$

to be

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle_{res} := -\widetilde{\int} \widetilde{\wedge}_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}(\alpha, \beta^\vee) \tag{51}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_\Delta$ is the diagonal bimodule, $\widetilde{\wedge}$ is as in Definition 5.32, $\widetilde{\int}$ denotes the cyclic Feigin-Losev-Shoikhet trace (which we can apply because $\mathcal{C}_\Delta$ is proper), and $\beta^\vee$ is the image of β under the isomorphism of Remark 3.28. The higher residue pairing is $\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$-sesquilinear, i.e., it is additive in each input, and satisfies

$$\langle f \cdot \alpha, g \cdot \beta \rangle_{res} = f \cdot g^\star \cdot \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle_{res}$$

for all $f, g \in \mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$.

Proposition 5.35 (Morita invariance of higher residue pairing) *Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be proper A_∞ categories, which are Morita equivalent. Then the isomorphism $\mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C}) \cong \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathcal{D})$ of Corollary 4.15 respects higher residue pairings.*

Proof The proof follows that of Proposition 5.20 closely. □

Proposition 5.36 *If $\mathcal{C}$ is a* dg *category, then our definition of the higher residue pairing on $\mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(A_\infty(\mathcal{C})) \cong \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C})$ (i.e., Definition 5.34) coincides with that given by Shklyarov (i.e., Definition 5.26).*

Proof Follows immediately from Lemma 5.33, together with Remarks 5.17 and 3.11. □

Proposition 5.37 *If $\mathcal{C}$ is an A_∞ category with finite-dimensional hom-spaces (i.e., finite-dimensional on the cochain level, not just on the cohomology level), then the higher residue pairing is induced by a chain-level map, given by extending the formula (44) $\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$-sesquilinearly.*

Proof Observe that $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}]$ is strictly unital, so we have the explicit representing cycle $e_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}$ for $\widetilde{\mathsf{Ch}}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta)$, as explained in Definition 5.30. We now observe that $\widetilde{F}_* = F_* + uF'_*$, so on the chain level we have

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle_{res} = \mathsf{Str}\left(F_*(e_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}, \alpha, \beta^\vee)\right) + u\mathsf{Str}\left(F'_*(e_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}, \alpha, \beta^\vee)\right).$$

Now observe that F'_* never outputs a term of length 1 (see Definition 5.28), so $\mathsf{Str} \circ F'_* = 0$ on the chain level. The proof now follows from that of Proposition 5.22. □

5.6 The higher residue pairing is covariantly constant

Definition 5.38 Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a $\mathbb{K}$-linear A_∞ category with finite-dimensional *hom*-spaces, together with a choice of basis for each *hom*-space. For each derivation $v \in \mathsf{Der}_{\mathbb{k}}\mathbb{K}$, we define a $\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$-sesquilinear map

$$H : CC_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C}) \times CC_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C}) \to \mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$$

as a sum of three terms: $H := H1 + H2 + H3$. For $\alpha = a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]$ and $\beta = b_0[b_1|\dots|b_t]$, we define

$$H1(\alpha, \beta) := \tag{52}$$

$$\sum_{j,k,\ell,m} \mathsf{tr}\left(c \mapsto (-1)^\dagger \mu^*(a_0, \dots, v(\mu^*)(a_{j+1}, \dots), \overbrace{a_{k+1}, \dots, a_\ell}, \mu^*(a_{\ell+1}, \dots, a_s, c, \overbrace{b_0, \dots, b_m}), b_{m+1}, \dots, b_t)\right)$$

where

$$\dagger := 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{j} |a_i|' + \sum_{i=\ell+1}^{s} |a_i|' + |c| \cdot |\beta|$$

(we recall that the choice of basis for each *hom*-space is necessary to make sense of the expression '$\nu(\mu^*)$').

We define

(53) $H2(\alpha,\beta) =$

$$\sum_{j,k,\ell,m} \mathsf{tr}\left(c \mapsto (-1)^{\dagger}\mu^*(\overbrace{a_0,\ldots,a_j}, \mu^*(a_{j+1},\ldots,a_s,c,b_0,\ldots,\nu(\mu^\bullet)(b_{k+1},\ldots),\overbrace{b_{\ell+1},\ldots}), b_{m+1},\ldots,b_t)\right)$$

where

$$\dagger := 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{j} |a_i|' + \sum_{i=0}^{k} |b_i|' + |c| \cdot |\beta|.$$

We define

(54) $H3(\alpha,\beta) :=$

$$\sum_{j,k} \mathsf{tr}\left(c \mapsto (-1)^{\dagger}\nu(\mu^*)(a_0,\ldots,\mu^*(\overbrace{a_{j+1},\ldots}, \mu^*(a_{k+1},\ldots,a_s,c,\overbrace{b_0,\ldots}), b_{\ell+1},\ldots), b_{m+1},\ldots,b_t)\right)$$

where

$$\dagger := \sum_{i=0}^{j} |a_i|' + \sum_{i=k+1}^{s} |a_i|' + |c| \cdot |\beta|.$$

Lemma 5.39 *We have*

$$\langle u \cdot \nabla_\nu \alpha, \beta\rangle_{res} + \langle \alpha, u \cdot \nabla_\nu \beta\rangle_{res} = u \cdot \nu\langle \alpha,\beta\rangle_{res} + H \circ (b + uB)$$

as $\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$-sesquilinear maps from $CC_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C}) \times CC_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C}) \to \mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$.

Corollary 5.40 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a proper $\mathbb{K}$-linear A_∞ category. Then the higher residue pairing is covariantly constant with respect to the Getzler-Gauss-Manin connection, i.e., for any $\nu \in \mathsf{Der}_{\mathbb{k}}\,\mathbb{K}$, we have*

$$\langle u \cdot \nabla_\nu \alpha, \beta\rangle_{res} + \langle \alpha, u \cdot \nabla_\nu \beta\rangle_{res} = u \cdot \nu\langle \alpha,\beta\rangle_{res}$$

as $\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$-sesquilinear maps from $\mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C}) \times \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C}) \to \mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$.

Proof By the homological perturbation lemma, any A_∞ category $\mathcal{C}$ is quasi-isomorphic to a minimal A_∞ category $\mathcal{C}'$ (i.e., one with $\mu^1 = 0$). We have $\mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C}) \cong \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C}')$, and the isomorphism respects connections (Theorem 3.35) and higher residue pairings (Proposition 5.35), so it suffices to prove the result for $\mathcal{C}'$. Because $\mathcal{C}$ is proper, $\mathcal{C}'$ will have finite-dimensional *hom*-spaces, so its higher residue pairing is covariantly constant with respect to the Getzler-Gauss-Manin connection by Lemma 5.39. □

5.7 Symmetry

Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a $(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$ bimodule. We recall the definition of the *shift*, $\mathcal{P}[1]$, which is a $(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$ bimodule with

$$\mathcal{P}[1](X,Y) = \mathcal{P}(X,Y)[1]$$

(see [Sei08a, Equation (2.10)]).

Lemma 5.41 *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a proper $(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$ bimodule. Then*

$$\int \wedge_{\mathcal{P}[1]}(\alpha,\beta) = -\int \wedge_{\mathcal{P}}(\alpha,\beta).$$

Proof We may assume that $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are dg categories, and $\mathcal{P}$ a proper dg bimodule. We recall that $\mathcal{P}$ corresponds to a dg functor

$$\mathcal{P} : \mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D}^{op} \to \mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K},$$

and that Shklyarov [Shk12] defines $\wedge_{\mathcal{P}}$ to be the map induced by this functor on Hochschild homology, composed with the Künneth isomorphism.

It is clear that $\mathcal{P}[1]$ corresponds to the composition of dg functors $S\circ\mathcal{P}$, where $S : \mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K} \to \mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K}$ is the shift functor. It now suffices to check that $\int S_*(\alpha) = -\int \alpha$, where $S_* : \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K}) \to \mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K})$ is the map induced by the functor S. Because the inclusion $\mathsf{fin}\mathbb{K} \hookrightarrow \mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K}$ is a quasi-equivalence, it suffices by Lemma 5.3 to prove that $\mathsf{Str}(S_*(\alpha)) = -\mathsf{Str}(\alpha)$ on $\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathsf{fin}\mathbb{K})$. This is clear from the definition of the supertrace. □

We also recall the *linear dual* bimodule, $\mathcal{P}^\vee$, which is a $(\mathcal{D},\mathcal{C})$ bimodule with

$$\mathcal{P}^\vee(Y,X) := \hom(\mathcal{P}(X,Y),\mathbb{K})$$

(see, e.g., [Sei14, Equation (2.11)]).

Lemma 5.42 *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a proper $(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$ bimodule. Then*

$$\int \wedge_{\mathcal{P}^\vee}(\alpha,\beta) = (-1)^{|\alpha|\cdot|\beta|}\int \wedge_{\mathcal{P}}(\beta^\vee,\alpha^\vee).$$

Proof Once again, we assume that $\mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ are dg, and regard $\mathcal{P}$ as a dg functor. We break the proof into four pieces:

First, we note that $\mathcal{P}^\vee$ corresponds to the composition of dg functors,

$$\mathcal{D}\otimes\mathcal{C}^{op} \xrightarrow{\sim} \left(\mathcal{C}\otimes\mathcal{D}^{op}\right)^{op} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}^{op}} (\mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K})^{op} \xrightarrow{\mathsf{dual}} \mathsf{perf}\,\mathbb{K}$$

(the first functor sends $c\otimes d \mapsto (-1)^{|c|\cdot|d|} d\otimes c$). Here, '$\mathsf{dual}$' denotes the dg functor that dualizes objects: on the level of objects, $(M_\bullet, d) \mapsto (M_\bullet^\vee, d^\vee)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} M_\bullet^\vee &:= \hom(M_{-\bullet},\mathbb{K}),\\ d^\vee(\alpha) &:= (-1)^{|\alpha|'}\alpha\circ d; \end{aligned}$$

and on the level of morphisms,

$$\mathsf{dual}(c)(\alpha) := (-1)^{|\alpha|\cdot|c|}\alpha\circ c.$$

One can verify that this is compatible with the A_∞ definition:

$$A_\infty(\mathcal{P})^\vee \cong A_\infty(\mathcal{P}^\vee).$$

Second, for any dg functor F, one easily checks that $(F^{op})_*(\alpha^\vee) = F_*(\alpha)^\vee$ (we apply this to $F = \mathcal{P}$).

Third, one checks that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \otimes CC_\bullet(\mathcal{D}^{op}) & \longrightarrow & CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D}^{op}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ CC_\bullet(\mathcal{D}) \otimes CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}^{op}) & \longrightarrow & CC_\bullet(\mathcal{D} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{op}), \end{array}$$

where the horizontal arrows are the Künneth maps [Shk12, Section 2.4], the left vertical arrow combines the isomorphism $CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \cong CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ of [Shk12, Equation (4.8)] (and similarly for $\mathcal{D}$) with the Koszul isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \otimes CC_\bullet(\mathcal{D}^{op}) &\to CC_\bullet(\mathcal{D}^{op}) \otimes CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}), \\ \alpha \otimes \beta &\mapsto (-1)^{|\alpha|\cdot|\beta|} \beta \otimes \alpha, \end{aligned}$$

and the right vertical arrow is induced by the isomorphism

$$CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D}^{op}) \cong CC_\bullet((\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D}^{op})^{op})$$

composed with the map induced by the isomorphism of dg categories,

$$(\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D}^{op})^{op} \cong \mathcal{C}^{op} \otimes \mathcal{D} \cong \mathcal{D} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{op}.$$

Fourth, one checks that $\int \mathsf{dual}_*(\alpha^\vee) = \int \alpha$. As in the proof of Lemma 5.41, it suffices to prove that $\mathsf{Str}(\mathsf{dual}_*(\alpha^\vee)) = \mathsf{Str}(\alpha)$; and this reduces to the obvious fact that the trace of the dual of a matrix coincides with the trace of the original matrix.

Combining the four pieces gives the result. □

We recall that an *n-dimensional weak proper Calabi-Yau structure* on an A_∞ category $\mathcal{C}$ is a quasi-isomorphism $\mathcal{C}_\Delta \cong \mathcal{C}_\Delta^\vee[n]$ (see [Sei08b, Section 12j], as well as [Tra08] and [She13, Section A.5], where it is called an '∞-inner product').

Lemma 5.43 *If $\mathcal{C}$ admits an n-dimensional weak proper Calabi-Yau structure, then the Mukai pairing on $\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ satisfies:*

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle_{Muk} = (-1)^{n+|\alpha|\cdot|\beta|} \langle \beta, \alpha \rangle_{Muk}.$$

Similarly for the higher residue pairing.

Proof The result for the the Mukai pairing follows directly from Lemmas 5.41 and 5.42, and the fact that the pairing $\wedge_{\mathcal{P}}$ only depends on the quasi-isomorphism class of the bimodule $\mathcal{P}$. The proof for the higher residue pairing is analogous. □

5.8 Hodge to de Rham degeneration

Definition 5.44 Suppose that $\mathcal{C}$ is proper and smooth. We say that $\mathcal{C}$ satisfies the *degeneration hypothesis* if the spectral sequence (17) induced by the Hodge filtration on $CC_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C})$ degenerates at the E_1 page.

Remark 5.45 The Hodge-to-de Rham degeneration conjecture [KS08, Conjecture 9.1.2] asserts that all proper and smooth A_∞ categories $\mathcal{C}$ satisfy the degeneration hypothesis.

Theorem 5.46 *If $\mathcal{C}$ is proper and smooth, and satisfies the degeneration hypothesis, then the polarized pre-*VSHS *$\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{C})$ of Theorem A is actually a polarized* VSHS*.*

Proof Any A_∞ category is quasi-equivalent to a dg category, via the Yoneda embedding; so let us assume without loss of generality that $\mathcal{C}$ is dg. Then $\mathsf{HH}_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ is finite-dimensional and the Mukai pairing is non-degenerate, by [Shk07, Theorem 4.6]; it follows that $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{C})$ is non-degenerate.

As an immediate consequence, the spectral sequence (17) induced by the Hodge filtration on any of $CC_\bullet^{+,-,\infty}(\mathcal{C})$ is automatically bounded (by the degree bound on $\mathsf{HH}_\bullet$) and regular (by finite-dimensionality); because the Hodge filtration is complete and exhaustive, the complete convergence theorem [Wei94, Theorem 5.5.10] implies that the spectral sequence converges to its cohomology. Hence, $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{C})$ has finite rank.

Finally, if $\mathcal{C}$ satisfies the degneneration hypothesis, then it is clear that $\mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-$ is a free $\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$-module. Thus we have verified all of the conditions of Definitions 2.6 and 2.7, so $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{C})$ is a graded VSHS. □

A Morita equivalence

The aim of this Appendix is to present a proof of Theorem 4.2.

Definition A.1 Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a cohomologically unital A_∞ category. We say that a set $\mathcal{X} \subset Ob(\mathcal{C})$ *split-generates* $\mathcal{C}$ if the smallest full subcategory of the triangulated category $H^0(\mathcal{C})$ which

- contains $\mathcal{X}$;
- is triangulated (i.e., closed under taking cones);
- is closed under taking direct summands;
- is closed under isomorphism,

is $H^0(\mathcal{C})$ itself.

Lemma A.2 *Let $\rho : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{Q}$ be a homomorphism of $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ bimodules. Let $\mathcal{X} \subset Ob(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathcal{Y} \subset Ob(\mathcal{D})$ be subsets which split-generate $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ respectively. If the map*

$$\rho^{0|1|0} : \mathcal{P}(X,Y) \to \mathcal{Q}(X,Y) \tag{55}$$

is a quasi-isomorphism for all $(X,Y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, then ρ is a quasi-isomorphism.

Proof Let $\mathcal{S} \subset Ob(\mathcal{X}) \times Ob(\mathcal{Y})$ be the set of pairs of objects such that (55) is a quasi-isomorphism. Suppose that

$$C_0 \xrightarrow{u} C_1 \xrightarrow{v} C_2 \xrightarrow{w} C_0[1] \tag{56}$$

is an exact triangle in $H^0(\mathcal{C})$. We claim that, if any two of $(C_0,D),(C_1,D),(C_2,D)$ are in $\mathcal{S}$, then so is the third. To prove this, fix D and consider the A_∞ functors $\mathcal{P}(?,D)$ and $\mathcal{Q}(?,D)$ (these are functors from $\mathcal{C}$ to Ch, the dg category of chain complexes). Because A_∞ functors carry exact triangles to exact triangles, applying these functors to the exact triangle (56) yields two exact triangles in Ch. Taking cohomology gives two long exact sequences, and ρ induces a morphism between them:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc}
\ldots & \longrightarrow & H^\bullet(\mathcal{P})(C_0,D) & \longrightarrow & H^\bullet(\mathcal{P})(C_1,D) & \longrightarrow & H^\bullet(\mathcal{P})(C_2,D) & \longrightarrow & H^{*+1}(\mathcal{P})(C_0,D) & \longrightarrow & \ldots \\
 & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho} & & \\
\ldots & \longrightarrow & H^\bullet(\mathcal{Q})(C_0,D) & \longrightarrow & H^\bullet(\mathcal{Q})(C_1,D) & \longrightarrow & H^\bullet(\mathcal{Q})(C_2,D) & \longrightarrow & H^{\bullet+1}(\mathcal{Q})(C_0,D) & \longrightarrow & \ldots
\end{array}$$

The claim now follows by the 5-lemma.

We next claim that, if $(C,D) \in \mathcal{S}$ and C' is a direct summand of C in $H^0(\mathcal{C})$, then (C',D) is also in $\mathcal{S}$. If C' is a direct summand of C, it means we have morphisms in $H^0(\mathcal{C})$:

$$C' \xrightarrow{i} C \xrightarrow{p} C'$$

whose composition is the identity $e_{C'}$. We denote $e_1 := ip$, and $e_2 := e_C - e_1$. Then e_1 and e_2 are orthogonal idempotents.

Now, because

$$[\rho] : H^\bullet(\mathcal{P})(C,D) \to H^\bullet(\mathcal{Q})(C,D)$$

is an isomorphism by hypothesis, it is also an isomorphism from the subspace $e_1 \cdot H^\bullet(\mathcal{P})(C,D)$ onto its image, which is precisely $e_1 \cdot H^\bullet(\mathcal{Q})(C,D)$. But now there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^\bullet(\mathcal{P})(C',D) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & e_1 \cdot H^\bullet(\mathcal{P})(C,D) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle [\rho]} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle [\rho]} \\ H^\bullet(\mathcal{Q})(C',D) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & e_1 \cdot H^\bullet(\mathcal{Q})(C,D), \end{array}$$

where the horizontal isomorphisms are given by multiplication with i, and the diagram commutes because $[\rho]$ is module homomorphism. We just checked that the right vertical arrow is an isomorphism, so it follows that the left vertical arrow is also an isomorphism, so $(C',D) \in \mathcal{S}$.

Applying these two results, together with the hypothesis that $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \subset \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{X}$ split-generates $\mathcal{C}$, it follows that $\mathcal{S}$ contains $Ob(\mathcal{C}) \times \mathcal{Y}$. We then repeat the foregoing argument, applying it instead to the second variable Y, to conclude that $\mathcal{S} = Ob(\mathcal{C}) \times Ob(\mathcal{D})$. Hence ρ is a quasi-isomorphism. □

Lemma A.3 *If $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ is a cohomologically full and faithful A_∞ functor, and $\mathcal{D}$ is split-generated by the image of F, then $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are Morita equivalent.*

Proof We define the $(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$ bimodule $\mathcal{M} := (F \otimes \mathrm{Id})^* \mathcal{D}_\Delta$, and the $(\mathcal{D},\mathcal{C})$ bimodule $\mathcal{N} := (\mathrm{Id} \otimes F)^* \mathcal{D}_\Delta$. Tensor products of bimodules respect pullbacks in the following sense: If $F_i : \mathcal{C}_i \to \mathcal{D}_i$ are A_∞ functors for $i = 1,2,3$, then there is a morphism of bimodules

$$(F_1 \otimes F_2)^* \mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{C}_2} (F_2 \otimes F_3)^* \mathcal{N} \to (F_1 \otimes F_3)^* \left(\mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}_2} \mathcal{N} \right). \tag{57}$$

It is given by the formula

$$m[a_1|\dots|a_s]n \mapsto \sum m[F_2(a_1,\dots)|\dots|F_2(\dots,a_s)]n$$

(no higher maps). If F_2 is the identity functor, it is clear from the formula that (57) is the identity. It follows immediately that

$$\mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N} \cong (F \otimes F)^* \mathcal{D}_\Delta.$$

There is a natural morphism

$$\mathcal{C}_\Delta \to (F \otimes F)^* \mathcal{D}_\Delta,$$

given by contracting all terms with F. This morphism is clearly a quasi-isomorphism when F is cohomologically full and faithful. Therefore, $\mathcal{C}_\Delta \cong \mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}$ as required.

It remains to prove that $\mathcal{N} \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{M} \cong \mathcal{D}_\Delta$. From (57), we obtain a morphism of bimodules

$$\mathcal{N} \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{M} \to (\mathrm{Id} \otimes \mathrm{Id})^* (\mathcal{D}_\Delta \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{D}_\Delta) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{D}_\Delta. \tag{58}$$

So it remains to prove that this morphism is a quasi-isomorphism of $(\mathcal{D},\mathcal{D})$ bimodules. The linear term of (58) is the map

$$\bigoplus hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{D}}(F(X_0),U)\otimes hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{C}}(X_1,X_0)\otimes\ldots\otimes hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{C}}(X_s,X_{s-1})\otimes hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{D}}(V,F(X_s))\to hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{D}}(V,U) \tag{59}$$

given by the formula

$$m[a_1|\ldots|a_s]n\mapsto\sum\mu^*(m,F^\bullet(c_1,\ldots),\ldots,F^\bullet(\ldots,a_s),n). \tag{60}$$

We now prove that (59) is a quasi-isomorphism in the special case that $U=F(\tilde{U})$ and $V=F(\tilde{V})$. To do this, we observe that the following diagram commutes up to homotopy:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}\bigoplus hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{C}}(X_0,\tilde{U})\otimes\mathcal{C}(X_0,\ldots,X_s)\otimes hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{C}}(\tilde{V},X_s) & \xrightarrow{\mu^*_{\mathcal{C}}} & hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{C}}(\tilde{U},\tilde{V})\\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle F^\bullet\otimes\mathrm{Id}\otimes F^\bullet} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle F^1}\\ \bigoplus hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{D}}(F(Y_0),F(\tilde{U}))\otimes\mathcal{C}(Y_0,\ldots,Y_t)\otimes hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{D}}(F(\tilde{V}),F(Y_t)) & \longrightarrow & hom^\bullet_{\mathcal{D}}(F(\tilde{U}),F(\tilde{V})).\end{array} \tag{61}$$

The left vertical map sends

$$m[a_1|\ldots|a_s]n\mapsto\sum F^\bullet(m,a_1,\ldots)[a_{i+1}|\ldots|a_j]F^\bullet(a_{j+1},\ldots,a_s,n).$$

(compare [Gan13, Equation (2.240)]). The bottom horizontal map is precisely the map (59). The diagram commutes up to the homotopy given by

$$m[a_1|\ldots|a_s]n\mapsto F^\bullet(m,c_1,\ldots,c_s,n),$$

using the A_∞ functor equations for F. Furthermore, the top horizontal arrow is a quasi-isomorphism (it is the first term in the quasi-isomorphism $\mathcal{C}_\Delta\otimes_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{C}_\Delta\cong\mathcal{C}_\Delta$); the right vertical arrow is a quasi-isomorphism (because F is cohomologically full and faithful); the left vertical arrow is a quasi-isomorphism, by a comparison argument for the spectral sequences induced by the obvious length filtrations, again using the fact that F is cohomologically full and faithful. It follows that the bottom map is a quasi-isomorphism. So (59) is a quasi-isomorphism when U and V are in the image of F.

It follows that (59) is a quasi-isomorphism of bimodules, by Lemma A.2 and the hypothesis that the image of F split-generates $\mathcal{D}$. □

Theorem A.4 (Theorem 4.2) *$\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are Morita equivalent if and only if $\mathrm{tw}^\pi\,\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathrm{tw}^\pi\,\mathcal{D}$ are quasi-equivalent.*

Proof First, we prove the 'if'. Suppose $\mathrm{tw}^\pi\,\mathcal{C}\cong\mathrm{tw}^\pi\,\mathcal{D}$. Consider the A_∞ functors

$$\mathcal{C}\hookrightarrow\mathrm{tw}^\pi\,\mathcal{C}\to\mathrm{tw}^\pi\,\mathcal{D}\hookleftarrow\mathcal{D}.$$

The hypotheses of Lemma A.3 are satisfied by each of them, hence each defines a Morita equivalence.

For the 'only if', we rely on [Kel06, Theorem 3.4], which is due to [TT90] and [Nee92]. Namely, we consider the dg category $\mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathcal{C}$ of right A_∞ $\mathcal{C}$-modules: its cohomological category $H^*(\mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathcal{C})$ is a triangulated category, which admits arbitrary coproducts and is compactly generated by the Yoneda modules. We call an object of $\mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathcal{C}$ *compact* if the corresponding object of the triangulated category $H^*(\mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathcal{C})$ is compact in the usual sense. Then, the subcategory of compact objects of $\mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathcal{C}$ is precisely the triangulated split-closure of the image of the Yoneda embedding, by the above-mentioned theorem. We refer to it as $\mathcal{C}^{perf}$: it is quasi-equivalent to $\mathrm{tw}^\pi\,\mathcal{C}$ by the uniqueness of triangulated split-closures [Sei08b, Lemma 4.7].

Now suppose $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are Morita equivalent. Then we have a quasi-equivalence of dg categories,

$$\mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathcal{C}\cong\mathsf{mod}\text{-}\mathcal{D},$$

given by tensoring with the Morita bimodule. As a consequence, the respective subcategories of compact objects, $\mathcal{C}^{perf}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{perf}$, are quasi-equivalent: hence $\mathrm{tw}^\pi\,\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathrm{tw}^\pi\,\mathcal{D}$ are quasi-equivalent. □

B Functoriality of the Getzler-Gauss-Manin connection

The aim of this appendix is to prove Theorem 3.35.

Lemma B.1 *Let $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ be an A_∞ functor. Define $H_1, H_2 : CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to CC_\bullet(\mathcal{D})$ by*

(62) $H_1(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) :=$

$$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j} F^*\left(a_0, \dots, \nu(\mu^*_{\mathcal{C}}(a_{j+1}, \dots), \overbrace{\dots, a_k}\right)\left[F^*(a_{k+1}, \dots)|\dots|F^*(\dots, a_s)\right].$$

and

(63) $H_2(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) :=$

$$\sum \mu^*_{\mathcal{D}}\left(F^*(a_0, \dots), \dots, \nu(F^*)(\dots), \overbrace{F^*(\dots), \dots, F^*(\dots)}\right)\left[F^*(\dots)|\dots|F^*(\dots, a_s)\right].$$

Define $H := H_1 - H_2$. Then

$$F_*(b^{1|1}(\nu(\mu^*_{\mathcal{C}})|\alpha) = b^{1|1}(\nu(\mu^*_{\mathcal{D}})|F_*(\alpha)) + b(H(\alpha)) + H(b(\alpha))$$

for all $\alpha \in CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$. In particular, on the level of cohomology,

$$F_*(\mathsf{KS}(\nu) \cap \alpha) = \mathsf{KS}(\nu) \cap F_*(\alpha).$$

Proof By the A_∞ functor equation,

(64) $$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j} F^*\left(a_0, \dots, \mu^*(a_{j+1}, \dots), \dots, a_i\right)[a_{i+1}|\dots|a_s]$$
$$= \sum \mu^*\left(F^*(a_0, \dots), F^*(\dots), \dots, F^*(\dots, a_i)\right)[a_{i+1}|\dots|a_s]$$

for all i. Pre-compose this relation with the map $G_i : CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C})$, defined by

$$G_i(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) := \sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j} a_0[a_1|\dots|\nu(\mu^*)(a_{j+1}, \dots)|\overbrace{\dots|a_i}|\dots|a_s].$$

One obtains

(65) $$A1 + A + A2 + A3 = A4 + A5,$$

where

(66) $A1(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) :=$

$$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j+\varepsilon_k} F^*\left(a_0, \dots, \mu^*(a_{j+1}, \dots), \dots, \nu(\mu^*)(a_{k+1}, \dots), \overbrace{\dots, a_i}\right)\left[F^*(a_{i+1}, \dots)|\dots|F^*(\dots, a_s)\right],$$

(67) $A(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) :=$

$$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j+\varepsilon_k} F^*\left(a_0, \dots, \mu^*\left(a_{j+1}, \dots, \nu(\mu^*)(a_{k+1}, \dots), \overbrace{\dots, a_i}\right), \dots\right)\left[F^*(\dots)|\dots|F^*(\dots, a_s)\right],$$

(68) $A2(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) :=$

$$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j+\varepsilon_k} F^*\left(a_0, \dots, \mu^*\left(a_{j+1}, \dots, \nu(\mu^*)(a_{k+1}, \dots), \dots\right), \overbrace{\dots, a_i}\right)\left[F^*(\dots)|\dots|F^*(\dots, a_s)\right],$$

(69) $A3(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) :=$

$$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j+\varepsilon_k} F^*\left(a_0, \dots, \nu(\mu^*)(a_{j+1}, \dots), \overbrace{\dots, \mu^*(a_{k+1}, \dots), \dots, a_i}\right)\left[F^*(\dots)|\dots|F^*(\dots, a_s)\right],$$

(70) $A4(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) :=$

$$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j} \mu^* \left(F^*(a_0,\dots), \dots, F^* \left(\dots, \nu(\mu^*)(a_{j+1},\dots), \overbrace{\dots, a_i} \right), \dots, F^*(\dots) \right) \left[\dots | F^*(\dots, a_s) \right],$$

(71) $A5(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) :=$

$$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j} \mu^* \left(F^*(a_0,\dots), \dots, F^* \left(\dots, \nu(\mu^*)(a_{j+1},\dots), \dots \right), \overbrace{F^*(\dots), \dots, F^*(\dots, a_i)} \right) \left[\dots | F^*(\dots, a_s) \right].$$

By the A_∞ relations $\mu^* \circ \mu^* = 0$, we find that

(72) $$C1 + C2 + C3 + C4 = 0,$$

where

(73) $C1(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) :=$

$$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j} \mu^* \left(F^*(a_0,\dots), \dots, \mu^* \left(F^*(a_{j+1},\dots), \dots \right), \dots, \nu(F^*)(\dots), \overbrace{\dots, F^*(\dots, a_i)} \right) \left[\dots | F^*(\dots, a_s) \right],$$

(74) $C2(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) :=$

$$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j} \mu^* \left(F^*(a_0,\dots), \dots, \mu^* \left(F^*(a_{j+1},\dots), \dots, \nu(F^*)(\dots), \overbrace{\dots, F^*(\dots)} \right), \dots, a_i \right) \left[\dots | F^*(\dots, a_s) \right],$$

(75) $C3(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) :=$

$$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j} \mu^* \left(F^*(a_0,\dots), \dots, \mu^* \left(F^*(a_{j+1},\dots), \dots, \nu(F^*)(\dots), \dots \right), \overbrace{F^*(\dots), \dots, F^*(\dots, a_i)} \right) \left[\dots | F^*(\dots, a_s) \right],$$

(76) $C4(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) :=$

$$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j} \mu^* \left(F^*(a_0,\dots), \dots, \nu(F^*)(\dots), \overbrace{\dots, \mu^* \left(F^*(a_{j+1},\dots), \dots \right), \dots, F^*(\dots, a_i)} \right) \left[\dots | F^*(\dots, a_s) \right],$$

By differentiating the A_∞ functor equation, we find that

(77) $$B1 + C3 = D + A5,$$

where

(78) $B1(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) :=$

$$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j} \mu^* \left(F^*(\dots), \dots, F^*(\dots), \nu(\mu^*) \left(F^*(\dots), \dots \right), \overbrace{F^*(\dots), \dots, F^*(\dots, a_i)} \right) \left[\dots | F^*(\dots, a_s) \right],$$

(79) $D(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) :=$

$$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j} \mu^* \left(F^*(\dots), \dots, F^*(\dots), \nu(F^*) \left(\dots, \mu^*(a_{j+1},\dots), \dots \right), \overbrace{F^*(\dots), \dots, F^*(\dots, a_i)} \right) \left[\dots | F^*(\dots, a_s) \right],$$

We now compute that

(80) $$b \circ H_1 + H_1 \circ b = A4 - A1 - A2 - A3;$$

all other terms cancel by the A_∞ functor equations (note: here, '$\circ$' simply denotes composition of functions, not Gerstenhaber product). We similarly compute that

(81) $$b \circ H_2 + H_2 \circ b = C2 + C1 + D + C4$$

(we must apply the A_∞ functor equation to obtain the terms $C1$ and $C4$).

Combining equations (65), (72), (77), (80) and (81), we find that

$$A = B1 + b \circ H + H \circ b.$$

We now observe that

$$A = F_*(b^{1|1}(\nu(\mu_{\mathcal{C}}^*)|\alpha)$$

and

$$B1 = b^{1|1}(\nu(\mu_{\mathcal{D}}^*)|F_*(\alpha))$$

by definition; so the proof is complete. □

Theorem B.2 *(Theorem 3.35) Let $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ be an A_∞ functor, and $F_* : \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C}) \to \mathsf{HC}_\bullet^-(\mathcal{D})$ the map induced by F. Denote by ∇ the Getzler-Gauss-Manin connection (Definition 3.32). Then*

$$F_* \circ u\nabla_\nu = u\nabla_\nu \circ F_*$$

on the level of cohomology, for all $\nu \in \mathsf{Der}_{\Bbbk}\,\mathbb{K}$.

Proof Define $H_3 : CC_\bullet^{nu}(\mathcal{C}) \to CC_\bullet^{nu}(\mathcal{D})$ by

$$H_3(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) := \sum e^+ \left[F^*(a_0,\dots)|\dots|\nu(F^*)(\dots),\overbrace{F^*(\dots),\dots,F^*(\dots,a_s)}\right].$$

Let $H^u : CC_\bullet^-(\mathcal{C}) \to CC_\bullet^-(\mathcal{D})$ be defined by $H^u := H_2 - H_1 + u \cdot H_3$. We will prove that

$$F_* \circ u\nabla_\nu - u\nabla_\nu \circ F_* = (b + uB) \circ H^u + H^u \circ (b + uB), \tag{82}$$

from which the result follows.

It suffices to prove (82) for $\alpha \in CC_\bullet^{nu}(\mathcal{C})$, by $\mathbb{K}[\![u]\!]$-linearity. We separate it into powers of u: it is clear that the u^i term vanishes for all i except $i = 0, 1$. The u^0 component of (82) says

$$F_*(b^{1|1}(\nu(\mu^*)|\alpha) - b^{1|1}(\nu(\mu^*)|F_*(\alpha)) = b \circ (H_1 - H_2)(\alpha) + (H_1 - H_2) \circ b(\alpha), \tag{83}$$

which holds by Lemma B.1. The u^1 component of (82) says

$$\begin{aligned} &F_*(\nu(\alpha)) - \nu(F_*(\alpha)) - F_*(B^{1|1}(\nu(\mu^*)|\alpha) + B^{1|1}(\nu(\mu^*)|F_*(\alpha)) \\ &\qquad = b \circ H_3(\alpha) + H_3 \circ b(\alpha) - B \circ (H_1 - H_2)(\alpha) - (H_1 - H_2) \circ B(\alpha). \end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

First, by differentiating the A_∞ functor equation, we obtain the relation

$$Q1 + Q4 = Q2 + Q3, \tag{85}$$

where

$$Q1(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) := \tag{86}$$
$$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j} F^*(a_0,\dots)\left[F^*(\dots)|\dots|\nu(F^*)\left(\dots,\mu^*(a_{j+1},\dots),\dots\right)|\overbrace{F^*(\dots)|\dots|F^*(\dots,a_s)}\right],$$

$$Q2(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) := \tag{87}$$
$$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j} F^*(a_0,\dots)\left[F^*(\dots)|\dots|\mu^*\left(F^*(a_{j+1},\dots),\dots,\nu(F^*)(\dots),\dots\right)|\overbrace{F^*(\dots)|\dots|F^*(\dots,a_s)}\right]$$

$$Q3(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) := \tag{88}$$
$$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j} e^+ \left[F^*(a_0,\dots)|\dots|\nu(\mu^*)\left(F^*(a_{j+1},\dots),\dots\right)|\overbrace{\dots|F^*(\dots,a_s)}\right]$$

(89) $Q4(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) :=$

$$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j} e^+ \left[F^*(a_0,\dots) | \dots | F^*\left(\dots, \nu(\mu^*)(a_{j+1},\dots),\dots\right) | \overbrace{\dots | F^*(\dots,a_s)} \right].$$

Now, we compute each pair of terms in (84) separately. We compute

(90) $$F_* \circ \nu - \nu \circ F_* = -P1 - P2,$$

where

(91) $$P1(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) := \sum \nu(F^*)(\overbrace{a_0,\dots}) \left[F^*(\dots) | \dots | F^*(\dots,a_s) \right],$$

(92) $$P2(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) := \sum F^*(\overbrace{a_0,\dots}) \left[F^*(\dots) | \dots | \nu(F^*)(a_{j+1},\dots) | \dots | F^*(\dots,a_s) \right].$$

Next, we compute

(93) $$b \circ H_3 + H_3 \circ b = P3 - P2 + Q1 - R1 - Q2,$$

where

(94) $$P3(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) := \sum \nu(F^*)(a_0,\dots) \left[\overbrace{F^*(\dots) | \dots | F^*(\dots,a_s)} \right],$$

(95) $R1(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) :=$

$$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j} F^*(a_0,\dots) \left[\dots | \mu^* \left(F^*(a_{j+1},\dots),\dots,\nu(F^*)(\dots), \overbrace{F^*(\dots),\dots} \right) | \dots | F^*(\dots,a_s) \right],$$

(all other terms cancel by the A_∞ functor equations). Next, we compute

(96) $$F_* \circ B^{1|1}(\nu(\mu^*)|-) - B^{1|1}(\nu(\mu^*)|F_*(-)) = S1 + Q4 - Q3,$$

where

(97) $S1(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_s]) :=$

$$\sum (-1)^{\varepsilon_j} e^+ \left[F^*(a_0,\dots) | \dots | F^* \left(\dots, \nu(\mu^*)(a_{j+1},\dots) \overbrace{F^*(\dots),\dots} \right) | \dots | F^*(\dots,a_s) \right],$$

(all other terms cancel by the A_∞ functor equations). Next, we compute

(98) $$B \circ H_1 = S1$$

and

(99) $$H_1 \circ B = 0.$$

Next, we compute

(100) $$B \circ H_2 + H_2 \circ B = R1 - P1 - P3.$$

Now, by substituting in (90), (96), we obtain

(101) $$\begin{aligned} F_* \circ \nu - \nu \circ F_* - F_* \circ B^{1|1}(\nu(\mu^*)|-) + B^{1|1}(\nu(\mu^*)|F_*(-)) \\ = -(P1+P2) - (S1 + Q4 - Q3) \\ = (P3 - P2 + Q1 - R1 - Q2) - S1 + (R1 - P1 - P3) \text{ (applying (85) and regrouping)} \\ = (b \circ H_3 + H_3 \circ b) - (B \circ H_1 + H_1 \circ B) + B \circ H_2 + H_2 \circ B \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows by substituting in (93), (98), (100). This completes the proof of (84), and hence the result. □

C Graphical sign convention

In this appendix we explain a convenient notation for checking formulae in A_∞ algebra, including the signs and gradings. We will not give the reader a fish, i.e., write down proofs of all of the formulae given in this paper (with the exception of the longest and most involved proof, which is given in Appendix B). Instead, the point of this section is to teach the reader how to fish.

C.1 The idea

The idea is to represent multilinear operations, such as the A_∞ operations $\mu^s(a_1,\dots,a_s)$, by a diagram as in Figure 1, which we call a *sign diagram*. The inputs will always be at the top of the diagram, and the outputs at the bottom. Strands in the diagram are allowed to cross, but no three strands should meet at a point.

Each strand in the diagram is oriented (from input to output), and carries an integer degree. By convention, strands which correspond to morphisms in our A_∞ category will carry their *reduced* degree, $|a|' := |a|-1$. Also by convention, the sum of the degrees of the edges coming into each vertex must be equal to the sum of the degrees going out. In particular, the A_∞ operations μ^s have degree 1 (with respect to the reduced degree), which is why we add the additional incoming red strand in Figure 1. By convention, all red strands will carry degree $+1$.

To any sign diagram D, we associate a sign $\sigma(D) \in \mathbb{Z}/2$, as follows: to each crossing of strands, we associate the product of the degrees of those strands (the Koszul sign associated to commuting the corresponding two variables). Then $\sigma(D)$ is the sum of these signs, over all crossings in the diagram.

Definition C.1 We say two sign diagrams are *isotopic* if they are related by a sequence of moves of the following two types:

- Moving a strand over a crossing;
- Moving a strand over a vertex.

Lemma C.2 *If sign diagrams D_1 and D_2 are isotopic, then $\sigma(D_1) = \sigma(D_2)$.*

Proof It is trivial that moving a strand over a crossing does not change the sign. When one moves a strand over a vertex, the sign does not change because of the assumption that the sum of the degrees going into the vertex is equal to the sum of the degrees going out. □

If we assign multilinear operations to the vertices in our sign diagram, then the sign diagram gives us a prescription for composing the operations: by convention, this composition gets multiplied by the sign associated to the sign diagram. By Lemma C.2, isotopic sign diagrams give the same sign, and they also obviously give the same composition of operations: so they represent the same composed operation.

C.2 Sign diagrams for operations in this paper

In this section we give the sign diagrams associated to various formulae in this paper.



(a) The A_∞ relations (see Section 3.2).



(b) The opposite A_∞ category (Definition 3.6).

Figure 1: The A_∞ operations: we always denote the multilinear operation μ^s with a solid dot.



Figure 2: The A_∞ functor relations (see (6)).



(a) The differential on $CC_\bullet(\mathcal{F})$ (see equation (9)).



(b) The brace notation (see Section 3.4).

Figure 3:



Figure 4: The operations $b^{p|1}$ (see equation (10)). The open dots represent Hochschild cochains $\varphi_i \in CC^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$. The blue lines are equipped with the reduced degree $|\varphi_i|'$ of the Hochschild cochain.



Figure 5: The map $F_* : CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \to CC_\bullet(\mathcal{D})$ induced by an A_∞ functor F (see Lemma 3.14). The open dots represent the maps F^s.



Figure 6: The operations $B^{p|1}$ (see Section 3.7). We recall that $B^{0|1}$ is the Connes B operator (see equation (13)).



Figure 7: The A_∞ multifunctor equations (see Definition 5.4). We have illustrated the case of an A_∞ tri-functor (the map is represented by an open dot), and only show one of the three types of diagrams on the right-hand side.



(a) The $F^{0;s;t}$ part of the tri-functor. (b) The $F^{1;s;t}$ part of the tri-functor.

Figure 8: The A_∞ tri-functor $F : A_\infty([\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}]) \times \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D}^{op} \dashrightarrow A_\infty(\text{mod-}\mathbb{K})$ of Lemma 5.7.



Figure 9: The chain map $F_* : CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}_1) \otimes CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}_2) \otimes CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}_3) \to CC_\bullet(\mathcal{D})$ associated to an A_∞ tri-functor $F : \mathcal{C}_1 \times \mathcal{C}_2 \times \mathcal{C}_3 \dashrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ (see Lemma 5.10). We sum over all cylic permutations of the inputs in each $CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}_i)$, but only allow cyclic permutations having certain properties. Rather than using the brace notation to indicate which cyclic permutations are allowed (it becomes rather confusing), we write labels next to some of the vertices of the sign diagram. A label 'j' next to a vertex means we only allow cyclic permutations of the input Hochschild chain in $CC_\bullet(\mathcal{C}_j)$ so that the initial term c_0^j gets input to that vertex.



Figure 10: The formula for the Mukai pairing, and also for the higher residue pairing (see Propositions 5.22 and 5.37). The pairing is given by the sum of traces of the maps given by the illustrated sign diagram (one could also represent this by connecting the ends of the purple line to make a loop).



(a) The map $F1$ from Definition 5.28.



(b) The map $F2$ from Definition 5.28.



(c) The map $F3$ from Definition 5.28.

Figure 11: The map $F' = F1 + F2 + F3$ from Definition 5.28 and Lemma 5.29. We have omitted the strands corresponding to the morphisms in the three input categories, to reduce clutter; the pattern they follow is clear from Figures 7 and 9.

References

[Abo10] Mohammed Abouzaid, *A geometric criterion for generating the Fukaya category*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. **112** (2010), 191–240.

[Bar01] Serguei Barannikov, *Quantum Periods , I : Semi-Infinite Variations of Hodge Structures*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **23** (2001).

[Bar02] ———, *Non-commutative periods and Mirror Symmetry in higher dimensions*, Comm. Math. Phys. **228** (2002), no. 2, 281–325.

[CdlOGP91] Philip Candelas, Xenia de la Ossa, Paul Green, and Linda Parkes, *A pair of Calabi-Yau manifolds as an exactly soluble superconformal theory*, Nucl. Phys. B **359** (1991), no. 1, 21–74.

[CIT09] Tom Coates, Hiroshi Iritani, and Hsian-Hua Tseng, *Wall-crossings in toric Gromov-Witten theory I: crepant examples*, Geom. Topol. **13** (2009), no. 5, 2675–2744.

[Gan13] Sheel Ganatra, *Symplectic Cohomology and Duality for the Wrapped Fukaya Category*, arXiv:1304.7312 (2013).

[Ger63] Murray Gerstenhaber, *The cohomology structure of an associative ring*, Annals of Mathematics **78** (1963), no. 2, 267–288.

[Get93] Ezra Getzler, *Cartan homotopy formulas and the Gauss-Manin connection in cyclic homology*, Israel Math. Conf. Proc. 7 (1993), 1–12.

[Giv96] Alexander Givental, *Equivariant Gromov-Witten invariants*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **1996** (1996), no. 13, 613–663.

[GPS] Sheel Ganatra, Tim Perutz, and Nick Sheridan, *The cyclic open-closed map*, In preparation.

[GPS15] ———, *Mirror symmetry: from categories to curve counts*, arXiv:1510.03839 (2015).

[Gro11] Mark Gross, *Tropical geometry and mirror symmetry*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, 114. American Mathematical Society, Providence RI, 2011.

[Kal07] D. Kaledin, *Some remarks on formality in families*, Mosc. Math. J. **7** (2007), no. 766, 643–652.

[Kel06] Bernhard Keller, *On differential graded categories*, International Congress of Mathematicians. Vol. II, Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2006, pp. 151–190.

[KKP08] L Katzarkov, M Kontsevich, and T Pantev, *Hodge theoretic aspects of mirror symmetry*, From Hodge theory to integrability and TQFT tt*-geometry, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **78** (2008), 87–174.

[Kon95] Maxim Kontsevich, *Homological algebra of mirror symmetry*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians (Zürich, 1994) (1995), 120–139.

[KS08] Maxim Kontsevich and Yan Soibelman, *Notes on A-infinity algebras, A-infinity categories and non-commutative geometry. I*, Homological Mirror Symmetry: New Developments and Perspectives, Lecture Notes in Physics, vol. 757, Springer, 2008, pp. 153–219.

[LLY97] Bong Lian, Kefeng Liu, and Shing-Tung Yau, *Mirror Principle I*, Asian Journal of Mathematics **1** (1997), no. 4, 729–763.

[Lod98] Jean-Louis Loday, *Cyclic homology*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften **301** (1998).

[Lun10] Valery Lunts, *Formality of DG algebras (after Kaledin)*, J. Algebra **323** (2010), no. 4, 878–898.

[Lyu12] Volodymyr Lyubashenko, *A_infinity-morphisms with several entries*, arXiv:1205.6072 (2012).

[Nee92] Amnon Neemann, *The connection between the K-theory localization theorem of Thomason, Trobaugh and Yao and the smashing subcategories of Bousfield and Ravenel*, Annales Scientifiques de L'E.N.S. (4) **25** (1992), no. 5, 547–566.

[PS] Tim Perutz and Nick Sheridan, *Foundations of the relative Fukaya category*, In preparation.

[PS15] ———, *Automatic split-generation for the Fukaya category*, arXiv:1510.03848 (2015).

[Sei08a] Paul Seidel, *A_∞ subalgebras and natural transformations*, Homology, Homotopy Appl. **10** (2008), no. 2, 83–114.

[Sei08b] ———, *Fukaya categories and Picard-Lefschetz Theory*, Eur. Math. Soc., 2008.

[Sei13] ———, *Lectures on Categorical Dynamics and Symplectic Topology*, Available from http://www-math.mit.edu/˜seidel/ (2013).

[Sei14] ———, *Fukaya A_∞-structures associated to Lefschetz fibrations II*, arXiv:1404.1352 (2014).

[She11] Nick Sheridan, *On the homological mirror symmetry conjecture for pairs of pants*, J. Diff. Geom. **89** (2011), no. 2, 271–367.

[She13] ———, *On the Fukaya category of a Fano hypersurface in projective space*, arXiv:1306.4143 (2013).

[She15] ———, *Homological mirror symmetry for Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces in projective space*, Invent. Math. **199** (2015), no. 1, 1–186.

[Shk07] Dmytro Shklyarov, *On Serre duality for compact homologically smooth dg algebras*, arXiv:math/0702590 (2007).

[Shk12] D. Shklyarov, *Hirzebruch-Riemann-Roch-type formula for DG algebras*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. **106** (2012), no. 1, 1–32.

[Shk13] Dmytro Shklyarov, *Matrix factorizations and higher residue pairings*, arXiv:1306.4878 (2013).

[Tra08] Thomas Tradler, *Infinity-inner-products on A-infinity-algebras*, J. Homotopy Relat. Struct. **3** (2008), no. 1, 245–271.

[TT90] Richard Wayne Thomason and Thomas Trobaugh, *Higher algebraic K-theory of schemes and of derived categories*, The Grothendieck Festschrift, Vol. III, Progr. Math. 88, 1990.

[Voi02] Claire Voisin, *Hodge theory and complex algebraic geometry I. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 76*, 2002.

[Wei94] Charles Weibel, *An introduction to homological algebra*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 38, 1994.

NICK SHERIDAN, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, FINE HALL, WASHINGTON ROAD, PRINCETON, NJ 08544-1000, USA.